

CAMP BONNEVILLE
RESTORATION ADVISORY
BOARD MEETING

Court Reporter: Jaime S. Morrocco, RPR, CM

Date: June 12, 2002

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Place: 6701 N.E. 147th Avenue
Vancouver, Washington

RIDER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

P.O. Box 245

Vancouver, WA 98666

(360)693-4111

1 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you all for coming in today.
2 A beautiful, sunny, sunny day. I very much appreciate you
3 joining us. At least it's air conditioned.

4 As is traditional, let's go around the table and
5 introduce ourselves. Again, if you are not a RAB member and
6 you don't feel like identifying yourself, you don't have to,
7 but you're welcome to.

8 There's a couple new faces around the table, as
9 well. After we've gone around and introduced some folks,
10 we'll make introductions to the new faces around the table.

11 Mike, if you would start.

12 MIKE NELSON: Mike Nelson, Corps of Engineers,
13 Seattle.

14 JEROEN KOK: Jeroen Kok, Vancouver Clark Parks and
15 Recreation Department, Clark County representative.

16 BUD VAN CLEVE: Bud Van Cleve, Northeast Hazel Dell
17 Neighborhood Association and RAB.

18 IAN RAY: Ian Ray, Lacamas Matney Neighborhood
19 Association and RAB.

20 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: RAB and Camp Bonneville
21 neighbor.

22 VALERIE LANE: Valerie Lane, RAB.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: Karen Kingston, RAB.

24 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Barry Rogowski, Department of
25 Ecology.

1 DON WASTLER: Don Wastler, citizen, resident,
2 registered voter, and I've been told that I'm a member of the
3 Restoration Advisory Board, but I have yet to see
4 confirmation.

5 GREG JOHNSON: Greg Johnson, Department of Ecology.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: All right. Thank you.

7 NORRELL LANTZER: I'm back here.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: Sorry.

9 NORRELL LANTZER: Norrell Lantzer, (inaudible)
10 assistance to EPA.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Join us at the table.

12 NORRELL LANTZER: I always stand back here.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you very much.

14 As I said, there are some new faces around the
15 table. A number of them are with the Department of Ecology.
16 Introduce yourselves.

17 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I'm Barry. I just wanted to
18 introduce Ben. I don't know if -- have you ever been to a RAB
19 before?

20 BEN FORSON: No.

21 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Ben is going to be taking over
22 project management responsibilities for the Department of
23 Ecology. Chris is not here because he's going to be working
24 on a Navy site tomorrow, today and tomorrow. So we're going
25 to do a little bit of a shift there, try to match up some

1 skills and resources, issues.

2 Chris will still be technical support and historical
3 and background support on the project, he's been around so
4 long, but Ben will be making the decisions as project manager
5 and working with the other Ecology staff here to distribute
6 reports, reviews, work load and everything else.

7 DAWNE GARDISKA: I'm Dawne Gardiska. I was on the
8 Camp Bonneville RAB when it first started years ago. I
9 haven't been here for a couple years. But I'll be working
10 with Ben and doing the public involvement angle for Ecology.

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You know Greg Johnson, who is our
12 ordnance and UXO expert that we hired from the Navy, now
13 working for Ecology.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you very much.

15 In the past, we've asked that we give you a quick
16 synopsis of some of the meetings we've been having during the
17 day prior to these RAB meetings. If you like, I'd be happy to
18 talk a little bit about that before we roll into the agenda.
19 Is there an interest?

20 IAN RAY: Yes.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay.

22 BUD VAN CLEVE: I think so.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: We actually had a meeting yesterday.
24 As well, our technical team, UXO team, had a meeting today,
25 and they'll be meeting again tomorrow. The primary focus of

1 the last few days has been focusing on the UXO/AOC screening
2 that we've talked about in the past. In fact, Greg is on the
3 agenda for a little bit later to talk about the outputs and
4 how we're going to use the screening matrix, what it is, and
5 where we go from here.

6 I brought for everybody another copy of the map with
7 the various AOCs so you can follow along and ask about
8 specific ones later on. I also have a larger map we can look
9 at.

10 We've been focusing on the UXO issues for the past
11 few days. I believe Ecology shares this opinion with me. I
12 think we're actually reaching a critical mass for the entire
13 project, and also for UXO. Things are finally beginning to
14 move forward. We're getting a clearer path forward.

15 Part of my feeling that is also a result of a
16 meeting we had last week where we're trying to figure out ways
17 to streamline and expedite cleanup for the other sites, namely
18 Landfill 4 and the lead and range issues for the small arms
19 ranges. We met with Ecology, and just throwing some ideas
20 together about how we can move things forward.

21 One of the elements of that is the Army proposed,
22 and Ecology was actually thinking along the same lines, that
23 the Army pursue funding for removal action to dig up and
24 remove Landfill 4. And there's advantages to that in that you
25 make sure that you address any potential future source of

1 contamination, you're removing the source. That doesn't
2 alleviate the issues regarding the groundwater, but it
3 simplifies the problem.

4 Now, as I said, I'm going to pursue funding, so we
5 currently do not have funding. I will be attending funding
6 meetings next week where I'll be requesting that. And, with
7 luck, and I feel hopeful about this, we'll receive the funding
8 and we'll pursue that expeditiously, as quickly as we can.

9 FRANK FUNK: The actual removal of No. 4?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Dig it up and carry it away to an
11 appropriate landfill where it's designed to receive this type
12 of material, with monitoring. There are landfills that are
13 designed to handle this stuff. Landfill 4 was never designed,
14 it was just a place they pushed stuff off the side of the
15 road.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: Do you have a speculation as far as
17 how deep you're going to go?

18 ERIC WAEHLING: We have estimates. We don't know
19 exactly how deep it is. We're going to dig until we stop
20 seeing waste. That's our intent. So we go until we stop --
21 we are estimating for our cost -- when I go back and request
22 money, I need to have some idea of how much I need.

23 BARRY ROGOWSKI: What we'll do is dig and sample and
24 dig and sample and dig and sample till we get it.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.

1 BARRY ROGOWSKI: As much as we can, if not all of
2 it. But we're looking at 12, 15 feet.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

4 IAN RAY: Will you fund based upon the number of
5 calculated cubic yards down to bedrock?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Hopefully not down to bedrock. But,
7 yes, it's largely based on cubic yards. There's also some
8 design element costs. You have to fill the hole in, grade the
9 hole. There's costs beyond just the cubic yards. But cubic
10 yards is the primary cost.

11 JEROEN KOK: It was my recollection that Landfill 4
12 was going to be utilized to dispose of any UXO that was found
13 on the site. If you remove the landfill, have you developed a
14 contingency for that?

15 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I would prefer that we not continue
16 to utilize Landfill 4. Ecology's perspective is we not
17 continue to use that for an OB/OD area. If that's going to
18 impede the cleanup of that site, I don't want it used, that's
19 not an excuse to get out there and clean it up as soon as
20 possible. I want it gone.

21 GREG JOHNSON: I can add a little bit to that, too.
22 The majority of the ordnance that we're going to encounter is
23 going to be of the catastrophic nature. So basically it's
24 going to be a blow in place where they find it, the majority
25 of it.

1 ERIC WAEHLING: So the answer is yes, we do have
2 contingency. It should not impede the cleanup of UXO.

3 JEROEN KOK: Thank you.

4 BUD VAN CLEVE: What about bringing stuff out from
5 the various law enforcement agencies?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: They haven't been doing that since
7 '95.

8 BUD VAN CLEVE: No more of that then?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: There has been no more of that since
10 1995. There will be no more in the future.

11 BUD VAN CLEVE: Okay.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: So am I understanding that you're
13 not going to move the OB/OD area; you're actually -- it will
14 no longer exist?

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: The contingency will either be in
17 place or temporarily constructed, if we have several items to
18 dispose of. Am I not correct there?

19 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.

20 KAREN KINGSTON: Do you have an idea of what kind of
21 temporary construction you're talking about? Some sort of a
22 pad or something on that order? Something enclosed?

23 GREG JOHNSON: My recommendation -- I don't think
24 they've got to that point yet. You've got to leave a decision
25 like that up to the SUXO for the contractor, senior UXO

1 supervisor. He has to be able to make the decision of what is
2 dangerous and what isn't, and what can and cannot be done with
3 it from an explosive safety standpoint. So basically we want
4 to leave that decision up to him.

5 But there's also a few other options. If you've got
6 some stuff you can move and you've got some stuff that has to
7 be blown in place, putting it next to it on the shot and
8 getting rid of it all at once is another option, too.

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Let me say, things that we do have
10 to move, that we can move, will be moved to a contained area,
11 with lining on the bottom, either concrete or several layers
12 of plastic and sand, plastic and sand, so it's contained.
13 Things that can be moved will be moved safely. Things that
14 can't be moved safely will be blown in place.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, the design for these
16 contingencies will be part of the design documentation before.
17 Before we start the activity, all this will be coordinated.
18 You'll know about it, know what we're going to do. All of
19 it's coordinated with the EPA, explosive safety people within
20 the Army. There's many, many eyes that look at this aspect so
21 that it's done safely. The last thing you want to do is hurt
22 anybody. Second, we want to make sure we don't make further
23 environmental issues for ourselves.

24 Then the other removal action that we're trying to
25 pursue - that we are pursuing - I shouldn't say "trying to."

1 The removal action that I'm going to request funding for is a
2 Phase I for the small arms ranges for where we have small arms
3 - pistols and rifles - that shoot lead bullets. We have berms
4 that catch the bullets. We're proposing -- the Army proposed,
5 and Ecology agrees, that it makes sense to go out there and
6 remove the bullets, remove the soils that have captured the
7 bullets, begin to address that issue.

8 Doesn't mean we're done. There's additional work.
9 But it's a big step towards dealing with that problem.

10 KAREN KINGSTON: Will you be covering this at
11 another point when you get closer to do it? Will we be able
12 to have some input?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: These are conceptual plans so that I
14 can go forward and request funding, knowing that Ecology and
15 EPA are on board with the Army's overall plan. As we design
16 the documents to actually do the removal actions, and again
17 these are not final actions, we refer to them as kind of
18 interim actions, Phase Is, so that when I go forward and
19 request the funding, I can tell the funding people that, "If
20 you give me this money, this is what we can get done."

21 In a nutshell, that's the activities of the BCT in
22 the last few weeks.

23 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Do you want to mention the
24 groundwater monitoring wells that we'd like to install?

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Sure. Another element of the

1 discussions we had regarding not only those two sites is the
2 site wide groundwater issue we've talked about. We came up
3 with some preliminary sketches, if you will, about how we want
4 to do it so we can make an estimate of how much money we need
5 for the number of wells to address the site wide groundwater.

6 The general idea - again, this is in very rough
7 terms - that we will locate the probable pathway that
8 groundwater would be leaving Camp Bonneville, and along the
9 fence line, very close to it, we'll install monitoring wells
10 to assure that nothing is leaving the installation. We'll
11 also have one or two monitoring wells that are further in so
12 we can triangulate to verify the groundwater is moving in the
13 direction we expect it to be moving. And then as we proceed
14 with the UXO clearance around the targets in the central
15 impact area, we'll also be looking at the soils to see if
16 there's a potential source for groundwater contamination in
17 the future.

18 So we're going to be looking at the boundary to
19 confirm nothing is leaving, then we're going to be looking at
20 the target areas to make sure that we don't leave a source
21 behind for future groundwater contamination.

22 But, again, this was conceptual, so I can go back
23 and request money.

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Is Clark County going to test
25 those wells periodically indefinitely?

1 ERIC WAEHLING: We're not there yet.

2 BARRY ROGOWSKI: The most important thing is that
3 since you all expressed such a concern about groundwater
4 contamination, off-site migration, we'd like to have 10 wells,
5 five locations, the most probable area where the groundwater
6 will be flowing off the base towards your homes, where we
7 could test in advance both the shallow and the deep aquifers.

8 There's two aquifers: a shallow and deep. We want
9 to try to get both of them if possible at all the locations,
10 then test on a periodic basis to make sure nothing's coming
11 toward your domestic drinking water wells.

12 In addition to that, we're putting one well
13 up-gradient farther from there at a good location, we think.
14 We're still working with our staff to make sure we get the
15 right locations and stuff, still working with them. But the
16 concept is to get it up-gradient. It would be kind of an
17 early indicator. It also allows to us triangulate to get flow
18 direction and try to get a better handle on flow.

19 Those are the things we're looking at.

20 FRANK FUNK: Won't it be kind of defeating your
21 purpose - I don't know, but I'm asking the question - if you
22 went into an area and cleaned it up for groundwater, and then
23 you found explosives there, you exploded explosives in that
24 area, wouldn't you be recontaminating the groundwater
25 possibly?

1 BARRY ROGOWSKI: No. We go right back in and clean
2 up all the residue immediately. Wouldn't let it ever get to
3 groundwater. Just go in, as soon as it was exploded, clean up
4 all the scrap and everything, run metal detectors, get
5 everything out of there, take confirmational samples that it
6 was done. We wouldn't let that happen.

7 JEROEN KOK: So, Eric, you're going to be pursuing
8 funding for all three of these actions --

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

10 JEROEN KOK: -- in the coming weeks?

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Next week.

12 JEROEN KOK: If you're successful with that, when
13 would these actions likely take place?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: We're going to start the process
15 immediately. It's weather-dependent, as far as whether we can
16 get to it this year or the following spring. We'll start the
17 process immediately.

18 JEROEN KOK: So if you're successful with funding,
19 then dollars would be available almost immediately?

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Right. You know, the bureaucracies
21 have to work. It might take a few weeks to actually get the
22 money available in our checkbook or bank account.

23 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That will be a big step forward, to
24 get it out of there and cleaned up ASAP and not wait around.
25 This is straightforward. We don't need rocket science to get

1 this figured out, just get going, if we can.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: That's the Army's desire, as well.

3 IAN RAY: For practical consideration, you could
4 take out 50,000 cubic yards, and there will be a big hole. Do
5 you have to fill it in with something?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes, or grading.

7 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We're talking about trying to
8 return it to natural, kind-of-natural, habitat. When you
9 think about it, that was a big hole that got filled in to
10 begin with. So we're just going to make it back the way it
11 was, then replant trees and natural vegetation. It will be a
12 natural slope back to before it was filled. It's going right
13 back to the way it was.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: But we haven't designed it yet.
15 This is part of the process.

16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You know, we can think through
17 that.

18 BRUCE OVERBAY: Ian is saying 50,000 thousand cubic
19 yards or whatever. Is this the possibility of what we've
20 talked about the time before, bringing in the burner to burn
21 the soils after the unexploded ordnances are taken out so you
22 can return that soil back?

23 ERIC WAEHLING: We will certainly explore the
24 economics of that, whether it makes sense to treat it on-site
25 or whether it just makes more sense to haul it away. We'll

1 certainly look at those economics. By far the simplest -
2 frequently simple is better - is to haul it away.

3 BRUCE OVERBAY: Economics-wise, though?

4 ERIC WAEHLING: We will take a look at that. We can
5 run those numbers easily.

6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: There's a lot of stuff, a lot of
7 rebar, all kinds of stuff.

8 BRUCE OVERBAY: Hard to say what's in there.

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yeah. I-beams, rebar, stuff like
10 that have been all around there. I don't know.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: All right. That's what we've been
12 up to.

13 JEROEN KOK: Good news.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Yeah, I think so. I'm very excited
15 about it.

16 Okay, our agenda. We have some RAB issues, RAB
17 business, not the least of which is an election of a community
18 co-chair. There's past issues. We can address these in any
19 in order that you would like. Is there a preference?

20 IAN RAY: I have a suggestion.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

22 IAN RAY: Deal with the membership part first.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Frank.

24 FRANK FUNK: Yeah, we had a motion not too long ago
25 that kind of went astray. I'd really like to put a motion

1 back on the floor. The motion is to clear the rosters, and
2 that those who reside outside the state be removed, and all
3 those who did not respond to the letter to stay with the RAB
4 be removed, and those who live outside the state be removed
5 also because I think the Department of Defense and the
6 environmental restoration program requires that they be within
7 the state and that they are -- that it affects their local
8 community. That's my motion.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Is it seconded? Don?

10 DON WASTLER: I have some Restoration Advisory Board
11 business that I'd like to address. Might take me a few
12 minutes.

13 IAN RAY: There's a motion on the floor.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Don, we have a motion.

15 DON WASTLER: Actually, I was the first one with my
16 hand up. Go ahead and continue your business.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Has the motion been seconded?

18 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I second it.

19 DON WASTLER: Actually, I have input to that before
20 you second that.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, it's open for discussion.

22 DON WASTLER: Well, I have something before this,
23 but I'll put this in here.

24 There are several people that have property, that
25 own property, within the vicinity of Camp Bonneville that are

1 not -- that don't live -- they don't live in the state, but
2 they own property here. Even if it's undeveloped property,
3 they still own property there. Don't they have a right to
4 know what's going on? They own property, pay taxes.

5 KAREN KINGSTON: I'd like to say something to that.
6 One of the guidelines for the RAB, for the membership for the
7 RAB, which also leads into the fact that I think all the RAB
8 members, especially us new ones, everybody needs to get the
9 paperwork, the documentation, the RAB --

10 ERIC WAEHLING: The bylaws?

11 KAREN KINGSTON: It's a handbook.

12 IAN RAY: DoD Guidance.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: There you go, it's the DoD Guidance
14 Handbook for Restoration Advisory Boards. I've got a link off
15 of your stuff in it, so you can get it that way.

16 But one of the things is in the Department of
17 Defense, on their website, and in all their documentation,
18 they list the community RAB as being "the affected local
19 community," spelled out very clearly. And it's constantly
20 referred to as "the affected community."

21 And then the Army, I went on to look and see what
22 the Army used as a stakeholder community definition. And they
23 also use the terminology "the affected community." They also
24 say that we have some responsibilities, and there's a list of
25 responsibilities that we each one sign on to, you know, by our

1 presence here. And one of them -- one of the responsibilities
2 is to attend regular meetings.

3 DON WASTLER: Right, I saw that in the bylaws.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: But I think if somebody owns
5 property here and they want to attend regular meetings or
6 maybe even send someone in their place, I think -- it would
7 seem to me, you know, that would be a consideration, as well.
8 But it says that RAB members are supposed to have -- to be the
9 affected community. There's six different sections that
10 describe it just as that.

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I agree with both of you. I agree
12 with both of you.

13 DON WASTLER: I have one more thing that Ian raised
14 at the November meeting. There's two ladies, Carrie Swenson
15 and Patty Reynolds, that were members of the board. He said
16 he doesn't have an address for them, but they were in the
17 phone book. I couldn't find Carrie Swenson in any phone book,
18 but that doesn't mean anything. I'm not in the phone book.
19 But Patty Reynolds was in the phone book. She lives just up
20 the street from me.

21 She's interested. In fact, she wasn't aware that
22 the Restoration Advisory Board was even meeting anymore.
23 She's not on your mailing list. She had no way of knowing
24 what was going on. So she would have been here tonight,
25 except for she said her daughter's getting married and she's

1 involved in a bunch of that stuff. But she is definitely
2 interested. I'm wondering how many other members that aren't
3 on the mailing list have been left out.

4 KAREN KINGSTON: Well.

5 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: They know where to go to
6 contact someone.

7 DON WASTLER: The Columbian newspaper is worthless
8 for information.

9 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: But the phone book isn't.

10 DON WASTLER: Correct. Ian didn't call her. I was
11 reading through the November minutes and saw his statement in
12 there and took the initiative to look through the phone book,
13 and I couldn't find Carrie Swenson, but I'm not in the phone
14 book.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: You actually bring up a good point.
16 This is actually another opportunity for the open house, the
17 community outreach program, to continue to remind the
18 community that there is this opportunity.

19 Also, I just wanted to say one more thing. You said
20 that adjacent landowners, don't they have a right to know
21 what's going on? They do. They absolutely do. Whether they
22 are RAB members or not does not preclude them from getting
23 information about what's going on.

24 DON WASTLER: I didn't realize -- I forgot you were
25 talking about RAB members specifically. But I do know that

1 there's people out there that own property that's undeveloped
2 that live out of state. One example I'm thinking of, the man
3 has been deceased for years, but his family is still paying
4 the taxes and taking care of the property.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes, they're entitled to any
6 information they want. It's an issue of RAB membership that
7 we're discussing here.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Even if they're not a RAB
9 member, they could still get on the mailing list and receive
10 information. So just cleaning up the roster is just a single
11 issue; that's different than somebody being involved.

12 DON WASTLER: I see what you're saying. My apology.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: No, those are good points.

14 DON WASTLER: I wanted to bring that up, though.

15 BRUCE OVERBAY: If you'll go back two years, Patty
16 Reynolds dropped out. She was on this board better than two
17 years ago. She basically came about two -- to about two
18 meetings and then dropped out, period. She's known all about
19 it, Don.

20 DON WASTLER: I was reviewing the November minutes
21 and Ian brought that up. I looked it up, and she lives up the
22 road from me. I gave her a call. She was home. She's still
23 interested in what's going on.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: Ian.

25 IAN RAY: It's a little fuzzy now last November, but

1 I was able to find each person on the RAB at that time. As I
2 recall, Karen Swenson was in Oregon. I don't remember Patty
3 Reynolds, but I was able to find her address because there are
4 still existing lists of RAB members going way back to the
5 founding of this board. They are available.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: In fact, I have copies of the
7 original list here for anybody that would like to see it.

8 So we have a motion, fairly specific motion.

9 FRANK FUNK: It's been seconded.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Is there more discussion about the
11 motion itself that people would like to have?

12 BUD VAN CLEVE: Would you repeat the wording on the
13 motion, please?

14 FRANK FUNK: My motion was that we clear the roster
15 of people who received letters and did not respond, do not
16 live within the state, reside within the state, and that are
17 affected by the local -- not affected by the local community.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: So it would be, for my own
19 clarification, non-respondents to the letter?

20 FRANK FUNK: Yes. And even if there was one that
21 responded to the letter but lived outside the state, they
22 would be removed also.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Okay.

24 VALERIE LANE: I'd like to add something because I
25 know that Frank Funk and myself, and I don't believe anybody

1 else in here has been in this RAB as long as he and I have.

2 FRANK FUNK: Bruce Overbay has.

3 VALERIE LANE: Maybe Bruce might remember this.

4 When we sat down and did the bylaws, it said right there, we
5 signed the papers, that you had to be a community member to be
6 on this RAB. You could not live out of state. It didn't say
7 anything about property, it said that you had to be a
8 community member to be involved.

9 So these people want to be involved, there's all
10 sorts of ways to find out, your neighborhood associations.
11 Get busy.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: Again, they can continue to be on
13 the mailing list for information, as well.

14 Shall we vote?

15 FRANK FUNK: Call for the question.

16 IAN RAY: Do I get to say something?

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. Then we'll call for the
18 question.

19 IAN RAY: I don't know about this parliamentary
20 procedure.

21 I had a general question. What's happened to John
22 Winther? John Winther is going to be removed because he
23 didn't respond and he wasn't here?

24 FRANK FUNK: John Winther was in the hospital. I
25 run into him. He just got out of the hospital. I haven't

1 talked to him recently. He did have the hospital experience
2 of some kind. I don't know.

3 IAN RAY: I see.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: I hope he's okay.

5 FRANK FUNK: But he can also make reapplication if
6 he wanted to.

7 JEROEN KOK: Eric, do we have a list of who
8 responded to the letter?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: We have a single response.

10 JEROEN KOK: And that was from?

11 ERIC WAEHLING: Stella.

12 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: But a response was -- it was
13 either to respond or attend.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Respond or attend.

15 BARRY ROGOWSKI: People can always get back on the
16 RAB if they want.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Absolutely.

18 BARRY ROGOWSKI: People that have property that live
19 outside the state, we can keep them on the mailing list, so
20 they can keep getting information, can't we?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Absolutely.

22 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Okay.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Call for the question. Don.

24 DON WASTLER: Response. Bob Frohs did show up at
25 the meeting. He was supposed to.

1 ERIC WAEHLING: He did.

2 All right. Call for the question. My understanding
3 is that ends debate. All in favor? Nays? Let the record
4 show it's a unanimous vote to adopt the motion. Thank you
5 very much.

6 Old business or other issues before we move on to
7 community co-chair.

8 DON WASTLER: I'm not really familiar with Robert's
9 Rules of Order. If I've kind of been out-of-bounds on that
10 through the minutes of the last meetings or the meetings I've
11 attended, accept my apology for that, please accept my apology
12 for that. My next exit from the library, I will have a copy
13 in my possession.

14 But one thing I am familiar with is the First
15 Amendment. And I should be able to come into these meetings
16 and say something, and my opinion should have just as much
17 respect as anyone else's. And even though I may disagree with
18 Mr. Ray and Mr. Van Cleve, I still respect their opinions.

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Don, from the Army's co-chair
20 position, you have every right to come and voice your opinion,
21 and it is respected.

22 DON WASTLER: It's respected from Eric, but I've
23 seen opposition from Mr. Funk on several issues. I don't want
24 to have to go through the minutes on that, but...

25 ERIC WAEHLING: I will remind --

1 DON WASTLER: There's minutes from May 9th, 2001.
2 There are a couple of incidences in there where I was simply
3 collaborating with something that John Winther said
4 previously, the chairman of the board. He burst out yelling
5 at me in anger that that's my opinion, quote, as though I
6 don't have an opinion or I don't have a right to an opinion.

7 There was another situation directly after that
8 where I simply asked a question that required a show of hands.
9 I wasn't making a motion. I wasn't even a member of the
10 board. He burst out in anger, yelling at me, telling me I'm
11 not the chairman, I don't have the right to ask for a vote
12 from anyone.

13 I should have the right to come in here and say
14 something without having this.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: If I could say something quickly.

16 Don, you're right. And you do, you absolutely have
17 a right to come in and voice any opinion that you want. I
18 think what's critical to the functioning of any body,
19 including the RAB, is that we continue to try to operate in a
20 courteous and respectful manner.

21 DON WASTLER: Mr. Van Cleve and the gentleman from
22 the FBI carried on for almost two pages about the FBI's lease
23 before Mr. Funk finally intervened and said it wasn't
24 Restoration Advisory Board business, but then actually got
25 into the conversation with them.

1 But I was talking about this book, Environmental
2 Assessment for Disposal and Reuse of Camp Bonneville,
3 Washington. I was discussing the contents within this book
4 that I received in the mail the day before the November
5 meeting. Mr. Ken Brunner attended the November meeting.
6 Mr. Ray was the one who got Mr. Brunner to distribute this
7 information and to attend the November meeting.

8 At that meeting, I was having a conversation with
9 Eric about what's on page two, the second paragraph from the
10 bottom, which is information within this environmental
11 assessment. Mr. Funk interrupted and said that that was
12 information for the neighborhood association, and it may well
13 be. Mr. Ray was the one that brought Ken Brunner to this
14 meeting. And as far as I know, there hasn't been any of this
15 information distributed throughout the Lacamas Matney
16 Neighborhood Association, nor do I know of Ken Brunner
17 attending any meeting.

18 I went around doing a Paul Revere, making copies of
19 this off my own budget, trying to inform people about this. I
20 didn't address Mr. Ray about it at the time because I didn't
21 want to challenge his authority.

22 After the heat at the last meeting over what is
23 Restoration Advisory Board business and what isn't business,
24 we were discussing business that was within this manual. And,
25 evidently, Mr. Blacklidge says that their funding is out, and

1 Eric has to take funding from his -- money from his funding
2 for the response to this.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, Don, I agree. I
4 personally don't like it when I feel that my opinion hasn't
5 been respected. And it's absolutely critical that we continue
6 to conduct ourselves --

7 DON WASTLER: There was some more information that I
8 brought up that evidently you guys don't have. Jeroen didn't
9 have it. Since when I found it, all I did was make notes, I
10 have no proof. I went back to County records and got copies
11 of it, which is the County assessment as to what they're going
12 to charge visitors per day when they go into the park. I have
13 copies here for as many people as I could afford to make them
14 for.

15 And there's also a timber evaluation assessment that
16 shows \$12,575,000 worth of timber on Camp Bonneville,
17 \$6,500,000 of it is marketable now. The estimate on the --
18 the evaluation on what the County is going to charge the
19 visitors per day, they may say that it's irrelevant, but that
20 estimate cost Clark County over \$4,800. The timber evaluation
21 estimate cost between \$5,000 and \$6,000. The range safety
22 evaluation cost another \$5,000. The range noise evaluation
23 cost another \$5,000. Both of those, I thought they could have
24 got that information from the Army Corps of Engineers.

25 And I also have copies of a letter here, a 1998

1 letter to the editor of the Columbia newspaper from a
2 gentleman in Battle Ground who was complaining about how the
3 County conducted Lucia Falls Park. And if that's any example
4 as to what's going to happen at Camp Bonneville, I don't want
5 to see any part of it because it just -- I've got copies of
6 it. I can give all this information to you, Jeroen, and
7 anybody else that's interested.

8 But, anyway, yes, I wanted to bring that up. If I
9 say something, it means that I've researched the information.
10 And even if I just have notes over it, it is valid. The
11 County records are about that thick (indicating). By the time
12 you go through Janice's applications for the homeless shelters
13 and all the things that are history and get down to the basic
14 things, there's some information there.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Right, there is.

16 DON WASTLER: And I wanted to bring that up at this
17 meeting.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you. And thank you for
19 reminding me to bring up another update on the EA. Don
20 mentioned that the FORSCOM was out of funding. I had some
21 discretionary funding available that I controlled locally.
22 And, yes, we are in the process of contracting to have
23 responses to the comments that were made for the EA. So we
24 will be seeing that. As soon as we have a contract and a
25 schedule, I will let you know when you can expect those

1 responses.

2 Yes?

3 DON WASTLER: In regards to your open house, I have
4 a list of public meetings that were held. Jeroen said there
5 will be some public meetings that will be held for public
6 comment. I have a list of dates of public meetings that were
7 held already, and a date, January 31st, 1998, where there was
8 an open house at Camp Bonneville, where there was a shuttle
9 from Vancouver Mall, picture in The Columbian of Col. Knight.
10 I said at the last meeting 300 people. My mistake. It was
11 actually 200 people.

12 I have copies of those newspaper articles, plus the
13 records from -- plus the copies of the information from County
14 records regarding the dates of those public meetings and the
15 contents of what was discussed at those public meetings.

16 I made as many copies as I could.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: That could be useful for the open
18 house.

19 DON WASTLER: I asked Ken Brunner if he reviewed
20 that. I have another letter from the Department of Fish and
21 Wildlife strongly recommending against any timber harvest.
22 And I saw Ken Brunner's name is there at the bottom of the
23 list. And I called him and asked him. He said that they did
24 review the minutes from those public meetings.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

1 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Don, I want to thank you for
2 bringing that up. That's really good information.

3 I'd like to have every member of the RAB have that
4 information if they want it for their review. I think Don
5 should be reimbursed for the money he spent.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: I agree.

7 DON WASTLER: It wasn't that much.

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think in fairness.

9 DON WASTLER: I don't want to see any more dead
10 animals. I don't want to see any more environment like I've
11 had to witness.

12 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It's all good information and we
13 should all have it, I agree. I don't think you should be
14 spending that money out of your pocket.

15 DON WASTLER: I had no choice.

16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We'll get that, let us know.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: We can make copies. I may not be
18 able to reimburse, but I can make copies.

19 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We'll figure something out.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Frank.

21 FRANK FUNK: I followed your conversation very
22 close, Don. And Mr. Winther called me out of order one time
23 here.

24 DON WASTLER: I recall that.

25 FRANK FUNK: And he was right, you know, because I

1 was talking about something that didn't pertain to what our
2 mission says. And the mission says here, "The Washington
3 State Department of Ecology and US Environmental Protection
4 Agency regarding the environmental investigation and
5 restoration of Camp Bonneville."

6 And that's what we're here for, the RAB, that's what
7 we do, what our purpose is here and our objective. And when
8 we go outside the boundaries of Camp Bonneville, we're talking
9 about something that we're not, in my opinion, supposed to be
10 in. And that's the reason I say whenever we go outside, about
11 the roads, anything else, outside the fence, we're talking
12 about what's going to happen in this area here, in Camp
13 Bonneville. That's our single purpose. For us to sit here
14 and talk about things other than that is detrimental to our
15 cause.

16 DON WASTLER: This was information that was
17 presented to the Restoration Advisory Board.

18 FRANK FUNK: I think every new person should read
19 that. I agree.

20 DON WASTLER: This is the information that Eric and
21 I were discussing. And to my knowledge, none of it's been
22 presented to the neighborhood association. We only have
23 annual meetings. A lot can happen in a year.

24 FRANK FUNK: Well, that's to be taken up by your
25 neighborhood association.

1 DON WASTLER: I feel that all the information that's
2 within this should fall into the realm of the Restoration
3 Advisory Board because this information -- this is how I got
4 this information.

5 FRANK FUNK: Okay.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: All right. Don, we'll talk after
7 the meeting to see about making copies for everybody.

8 We are just joined by Pete Capell.

9 We have one last item on the agenda before we move
10 to our break, and that is the election of a community
11 co-chair.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: I have something I need to
13 announce.

14 ERIC WAEHLING: We can either do it during open
15 discussion or now. It's up to you.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: I'll do it during open discussion.

17 FRANK FUNK: Would you like to move on to the
18 election?

19 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

20 FRANK FUNK: I'd like to place the nomination of a
21 person who has the ability to govern as a co-chair and also to
22 lead the organization from the non-military co-chair. He's
23 well-versed on the bylaws and what our mission is, what our
24 objective is. I'd like to nominate Jeroen Kok.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: County representative.

1 DON WASTLER: I'll second that.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to discuss that actually.

3 I have the utmost respect for Jeroen as a person, but he's
4 also here as a representative of the County government. I'm
5 not sure if that's necessarily appropriate.

6 FRANK FUNK: Does it say in this thing that we read
7 here a while ago that they're supposed to be involved?

8 ERIC WAEHLING: They are involved. They are
9 involved. We can discuss it.

10 Jeroen, do you have any thoughts?

11 JEROEN KOK: I'd like to respond. Thank you, Frank,
12 for the nomination and vote of confidence. But I personally
13 feel strongly that the community co-chair should be a citizen
14 member of the RAB that represents the citizens' point of view.
15 I think there are enough bureaucrats involved in this whole
16 process, that one more in a position of power leadership would
17 be one more too many.

18 FRANK FUNK: Well, you're on first base, you know.
19 You can talk right with those people.

20 KAREN KINGSTON: I'd like to nominate Ian Ray.
21 That's it.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: For formality's sake, Jeroen, are
23 you withdrawing your nomination?

24 JEROEN KOK: I'd like to, yes.

25 DON WASTLER: I respect Ian Ray. He's probably the

1 most capable person that's here. But I would like to bring to
2 everyone's attention that he is the president of Lacamas
3 Matney Neighborhood Association. And there's no law that says
4 he can't hold two offices. I don't think there's going to be
5 any conflict of interest. I'm just bringing it up because I
6 wish we had a neighborhood association.

7 I attended Bud Van Cleve's neighborhood association,
8 and I was very impressed. I wish we had something like that.
9 I know you told Holly that it was annual because of
10 attendance, but at least quarterly or something. We've got a
11 lot of problems that go way outside of this board with mail
12 theft, it goes on down the line. A lot can happen in a year.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Perhaps that's something you need to
14 talk about outside.

15 DON WASTLER: Right. The reason I brought this up
16 is he's chairman elect, and I just wanted to bring that up.
17 We need a neighborhood association.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: Any other discussion?

19 VALERIE LANE: Is he accepting?

20 ERIC WAEHLING: We should ask.

21 IAN RAY: It would be conditional.

22 VALERIE LANE: Can we hear the conditions? What are
23 the conditions?

24 BUD VAN CLEVE: For us or you?

25 BRUCE OVERBAY: How much we pad your pockets?

1 IAN RAY: I have to tell you that being the com
2 chair for six months has taught me a lot about how the RAB
3 works. And one of the things that I can't allow myself to get
4 back into is the polling of the group and assembling and
5 sorting all of the ideas for the agenda. It takes about three
6 weeks out of four to do that kind of work, and I just can't
7 afford to do it.

8 So I would be suggesting -- well, I would say right
9 off the bat, if I'm elected as the co-chair, I'm not going to
10 do it, so you have to elect me on that condition. And I would
11 have some suggestions as to what the RAB might do to get over
12 this kind of thing.

13 BARRY ROGOWSKI: The way a lot of other RABs are set
14 is that the agencies actually put the agenda together for the
15 RAB, but the RAB tells them what input. They work together on
16 it, instead of you having to do it.

17 That way we have some important things that we want
18 to discuss, like we have tonight, like UXO screening, Agreed
19 Order that Ecology is working on. We'd like to have some
20 input into the agenda also. We don't want to control it in
21 any way or be the only ones dealing with it, but take some of
22 the work load off of the membership.

23 Anyway, my recommendation would be actually that the
24 Army and Ecology set the agendas, with input from the RAB, and
25 we put agenda items on that you would like also, and try to

1 figure out relative priority of different things that are
2 going on, et cetera.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I think I mentioned Ian
4 because we've discussed this a couple times, that I wouldn't
5 mind, if anyone wanted to contact me about information, and
6 just let Eric or whoever know. I would help with the agenda
7 because I honestly think Ian does a good job. If he wants to
8 let some of that go to other people, I would help.

9 IAN RAY: I'd like to.

10 BUD VAN CLEVE: Has he been nominated?

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Yes.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: He has been nominated.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: And also seconded.

14 BUD VAN CLEVE: I would also second it under the
15 condition he be allowed to restructure the job like he feels
16 like it should be.

17 FRANK FUNK: Within the confines of the bylaws.

18 BUD VAN CLEVE: Within the confines of the bylaws.
19 And if we don't like it, we can tell him.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: That's right.

21 BUD VAN CLEVE: But let's get it done and move on to
22 other things.

23 IAN RAY: I'm then assigned a job of restructuring,
24 and I don't know that I want to do that either.

25 BUD VAN CLEVE: Rewrite the job description.

1 IAN RAY: That's a job, getting a consensus, all
2 that kind of stuff.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How about you take on the job
4 and delegate some of it to someone else?

5 IAN RAY: Okay.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: I think what Bud is suggesting is as
7 you see fit or appropriate.

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: This needs to be clear who is doing
9 what so we know. That makes it easy.

10 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, the issue of how we set
11 the agenda is related but a separate issue from the election
12 of a community co-chair, and a discussion we do need to have.

13 So call for the question.

14 FRANK FUNK: You don't need a question.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: You don't. Thank you, Frank.

16 Any other nominations? Okay, let's vote. All in
17 favor of Ian --

18 FRANK FUNK: Should be elected by unanimous ballot
19 because there's no other nomination.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: But it's fun to vote.

21 All in favor? Nays? By unanimous vote, Ian is our
22 community co-chair. Thank you very much, Ian.

23 (Applause.)

24 IAN RAY: Thank you.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: All right. I would like to suggest

1 that we table the discussion of how we set our agendas for the
2 open discussion at the end of the meeting. We have a
3 10-minute break scheduled on the agenda. I move that we take
4 a break.

5 (Break taken.)

6 ERIC WAEHLING: If we could get started. At the
7 last RAB meeting, we agreed to discuss the UXO screening, the
8 AOCs, where this is all going. Greg Johnson of the Department
9 of Ecology, bless his soul, volunteered to talk about this.
10 I'll let him -- I'm handing out reference maps for you to
11 refer to. These are the previously identified AOCs and AOPCs
12 for UXO concern, and the next step that we have just completed
13 is a ranking process of these AOCs, a centralizing of the
14 information. I'll let Greg take it from here so I don't spoil
15 it.

16 GREG JOHNSON: Okay. A brief history what we've
17 been doing. We have a subcommittee work group, and we're
18 doing a collaborative effort to develop how we're going to
19 address the UXO problems at Camp Bonneville.

20 It's myself; Mr. Lantzer; and his associate from
21 Gannett Fleming, they represent EPA; and we have Clark County,
22 Mr. Mansfield; and then the contractor, Jerry Moore, that have
23 been on the team.

24 So for about the past couple of months, we've been
25 developing a conceptual site model Level 1 screening process

1 to evaluate all the areas of concern and areas of probable
2 concern within Camp Bonneville, and then ranking them as how
3 we want to address them, severity of the problems.

4 We have several tables. I'm just going to leave
5 this table up here for right now, and then I'm going to read
6 through the hazard severity. I'm not going to read every
7 detail because there's a lot of it in here. I'll make it
8 available to anybody on e-mail or I'll send you a copy,
9 whatever, if you want to get into all the details. But I'll
10 go over basically what it's all about. Any questions as we
11 go, me or Norrell will be more than happy to answer them.

12 Okay, the objective of the Level 1 screening for
13 Camp Bonneville. The objective of the Level 1 screening for
14 Camp Bonneville is to provide a transparent, documented and
15 defensible process for the evaluation of appropriate actions
16 and the prioritization of those actions in each area within
17 Camp Bonneville expected to have OE/UXO contamination.

18 Features of Level 1 screening for Camp Bonneville.
19 The Camp Bonneville Level 1 screening has been designed to
20 provide a framework for the following:

21 One. Identification of all areas within Camp
22 Bonneville that may have been used for ordnance-related
23 activities.

24 Two. Development of a hypothesis for each area
25 describing the potential OE/UXO contamination in the area.

1 This hypothesis is structured as a conceptual site model for
2 the area.

3 That's what you're seeing up there right now.

4 The assignment of ranking factors, based on the
5 conceptual site model, that describe the relativity to other
6 areas within Camp Bonneville, explosive hazard for each area,
7 the assignment of screening factors based on terrain and
8 future use intensity to each area, evaluation of all available
9 information about each area to determine the appropriate
10 action to be taken in each area.

11 The remainder of this document describes the various
12 features of the Level 1 screening, starting with the
13 discussion of the types and amounts of information relating to
14 the OE/UXO contamination available for Camp Bonneville, a
15 description of the general conceptual site model for Camp
16 Bonneville, the ranking factors assigned each type of
17 conception, the assignment of terrain and future use intensity
18 factors, the potential outcomes of Level 1 screening, and
19 finally, a description of the Level 1 process for Camp
20 Bonneville.

21 Identification of AOPCs and AOCs. The Level 1
22 screen starts with the mapping of all information available
23 about Camp Bonneville. AOPCs and AOCs are identified as areas
24 in which it is suspected or known that ordnance-related
25 activities occurred. The two types of information we have

1 available are archival information and field information.

2 The conceptual site model for Camp Bonneville serves
3 as the framework for organizing the information about
4 ordnance-related uses. Conceptual site model provides the
5 hypothesis for the types and locations of OE/UXO contamination
6 expected to be on Camp Bonneville.

7 Components of the CSM that are used in the Level 1
8 screening process include ordnance-related activities.

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You've got your screen saver.

10 GREG JOHNSON: Sorry. It's the Hubble space
11 telescope.

12 Primary sources, primary release mechanisms,
13 expected contamination, and secondary source locations. These
14 components are discussed in the following subsections:

15 Ordnance-related activities. Based on the available
16 information, the ordnance-related activities that occurred on
17 Camp Bonneville are:

18 Ordnance storage, including the storage and issuance
19 of ordnance used on Camp Bonneville.

20 Weapons training. The training of military
21 personnel in the use of weapon systems within fixed,
22 established firing ranges on Camp Bonneville. Weapons
23 training occurred for artillery, mortars, hand grenades, rifle
24 grenades and rockets.

25 Troop training. The training of military personnel

1 from squad level up to platoon level in combat techniques and
2 maneuvers.

3 Ordnance disposal. The disposal of retrograde
4 ordnance, excess bulk explosives and unexploded ordnance at
5 fixed, established, open burn, open detonation - OB/OD -
6 areas.

7 Okay, the primary sources. Each of the
8 ordnance-related activities listed above have one or more
9 types of primary resources associated with it. For Camp
10 Bonneville, seven primary source types have been identified.
11 The primary sources associated with the listed ordnance
12 related activities are:

13 One, ordnance storage. Storage magazine, transfer
14 point, the building in which the ordnance was stored and from
15 which it was issued to personnel.

16 Weapons training, target area. A fixed area at
17 which weapons training exercises were targeted. Target areas
18 for the larger weapon systems may contain vehicles and old
19 appliances as target items.

20 Firing point. The fixed point from which the
21 weapons were fired during weapons training exercises.

22 The range safety fan. The buffer area fanning out
23 from the firing point to beyond the target area, established
24 to insure weapons training was carried out safely.

25 Troop training, training area. Areas used to train

1 military personnel in offensive and defensive techniques. On
2 Camp Bonneville, this training included the establishment of
3 defensive perimeters using training or practice munitions with
4 or without spotting charges, the infiltration of defensive
5 perimeters, and use of small arms and blank ammunition.

6 A maneuver area. Areas used for troop maneuvers
7 without the intentional deployment of weapons.

8 And ordnance disposal, open burn, open detonation
9 area. It's a fixed area to dispose of ordnance through
10 detonation or burning.

11 Anybody have any questions up to this point?

12 IAN RAY: What's the source of this material you're
13 reading?

14 GREG JOHNSON: This is what we put together. It was
15 originally used up on Adak. We've designed it specifically
16 for -- the same document we've designed specifically for Camp
17 Bonneville.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: So what the team has done, if you
19 look at the map and you see all the various polygons and
20 shapes on the map, what they've done is they've gone through
21 and looked at each one and categorized by the definition that
22 Greg was relating to us where each one of these falls into it.
23 So we now have a category. Is it a firing point? Is it a
24 target? Is it an OB/OD site? Then that allows us to apply a
25 conceptual site model to start assessing the hazards

1 associated with it.

2 Is that about right, Greg?

3 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.

4 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yes.

5 DAWNE GARDISKA: For those of us that can't keep up
6 with you note taking, will this be available?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: It is.

8 GREG JOHNSON: I'll e-mail it to you.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: I brought a few discs with all the
10 information. When I brought it down on Monday, we were
11 finalizing this -- working through finalizing it today.
12 There's a few small typos. It's still in draft. The agencies
13 haven't had a chance to go through every one line by line, but
14 it's probably very close.

15 GREG JOHNSON: That doesn't have this on it. But I
16 have that.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm sorry. Greg can get it
18 available to anybody.

19 DAWNE GARDISKA: Can I get it on the web?

20 GREG JOHNSON: No.

21 NORRELL LANTZER: We haven't presented it to the
22 project team leaders yet. The subcommittee is done with it.
23 We went through the screening over the last couple days. We
24 got some more to do tomorrow. The subcommittee is now ready
25 to present that document, the Level 1 hazard screening

1 document. We think it's good to go.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: We will make hard copies available
3 of what -- we'll see if we can figure out a way to get it on
4 the web. In the interim, we'll make hard copies available.

5 FRANK FUNK: You will mail those to us?

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Would you like us to?

7 FRANK FUNK: Yes.

8 ERIC WAEHLING: I'll include it with the RAB
9 minutes. We can do that.

10 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How many established open
11 burn, open detonation areas are there?

12 GREG JOHNSON: Three.

13 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Three?

14 GREG JOHNSON: Yes.

15 NORRELL LANTZER: Three identified.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Are they titled Landfill 2, 3
17 and 4?

18 NORRELL LANTZER: It's OB/OD1, OB/OD2, OB/OD3.

19 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Isn't Landfill 4 used to
20 detonate? It's two different titles?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: What happened is they had a
22 landfill, then on top of that they conducted the OB/OD
23 activity. They're co-located.

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Okay.

25 NORRELL LANTZER: Let me give you a little bit more

1 background on the Level 1 screen. Greg mentioned it's adapted
2 from Adak, which is a Navy project. It really precedes that,
3 to ^ Colby Island in '94, '95 when I first wrote it then. We
4 refined it for Adak, and then this is a further revision.
5 We've tried to make it site specific for each one of the
6 projects.

7 What I'm more happy with for the Camp Bonneville one
8 is it has more applicability to more sites elsewhere. For
9 those of you who are attending the ITRC training in July,
10 you're going to see some of this stuff. We train using that
11 hazardous screening.

12 BARRY ROGOWSKI: The important thing is this model
13 is specifically designed and applicable for Camp Bonneville.

14 NORRELL LANTZER: Yes, site specific. Those areas
15 that he's talking about, those are right from the ASR, all the
16 hypotheses for Bonneville.

17 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Very important thing is that this
18 categorizes analyzing every single specific area. There are
19 over a hundred of them where ordnance was ever suspected to
20 be. And it looks at every specific single issue that could
21 occur at each area and categorizes it very nicely,
22 prioritizes.

23 So with that, Greg.

24 GREG JOHNSON: Okay. Also these -- all the ones I'm
25 reading right now are across the very top. I kind of jumped

1 ahead. I hope everybody is following that. I'm down to
2 release mechanisms. That's the third one over.

3 ERIC WAEHLING: Maybe if you could summarize in your
4 own words, because some of us aren't as up to date on the
5 language that's used in the document.

6 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah, that's fine. Okay, good.

7 Primary release mechanism is basically how it got
8 there, what put it there. Actually, we can just shift over to
9 this. I will make this available to anybody who wants it.
10 I'll e-mail it or make a copy or whatever.

11 So just for example, we see over here, you have
12 ordnance storage. Okay, that's your related activity.

13 SEAN SHELDRAKE: Can you see that better?

14 FRANK FUNK: Much better.

15 GREG JOHNSON: Primary source. Storage magazines
16 transfer point. Primary release mechanisms would be
17 mishandling or loss. We know nothing was fired from there,
18 okay?

19 So then we go over to expected ordnance
20 contamination. It's going to be non-deployed munitions. Now,
21 non-deployed munitions means they aren't armed, which is
22 pretty important. Okay, the secondary source location would
23 be surface.

24 As we move down here, next category will be weapons
25 training. Then we had to subdivide this one down to firing

1 points, target areas and range safety fans.

2 Then for release mechanisms, we have several. So
3 it's getting more complicated as it goes. Mishandling, loss,
4 abandonment, burial, propellant burn area, muzzle end area.
5 Then we have non-deployed munitions, non-deployed munitions,
6 explosive residuals, and the contamination, which is going to
7 be surface, subsurface and soil.

8 JEROEN KOK: Greg, I understand the difference
9 between surface and subsurface, but how does soil fit into
10 that?

11 GREG JOHNSON: The soil is contaminated.

12 JEROEN KOK: At the surface?

13 GREG JOHNSON: Residues from the blasts and stuff
14 like that.

15 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Not actual pieces of ordnance, but
16 chemical residue.

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Just like the RDX at Landfill 4.

18 JEROEN KOK: So you either have chunks at the
19 surface, chunks in the subsurface, or residue contamination in
20 the soil?

21 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yes.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

23 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Why is water not listed as a
24 secondary source location? It seems as though that water
25 would be different from soil because it can move.

1 SEAN SHELDRAKE: One thing that this does, we're
2 trying to marry the two issues of ordnance as well as the
3 residue issues in the table.

4 NORRELL LANTZER: We have addressed the water -
5 groundwater - source, but that's not a primary source for
6 here. In the diagram you'll see it. It's one of the
7 secondary migration mechanisms.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I was asking about that
9 column, the secondary.

10 NORRELL LANTZER: Unfortunately, we can have the
11 column, but it gets real wide.

12 SEAN SHELDRAKE: The reason soil is listed and not
13 water is you start -- ideally you start with soil, see if
14 there is residue. If there's not residue in soil, the
15 presumption is there wouldn't be a mechanism with which to get
16 contaminants into groundwater. It would start with where you
17 had the explosion, or the residue, then migrate through the
18 soil column into the groundwater, with precipitation,
19 groundwater fluctuation. That's why soil is included.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: Start in the dirt and go to the
21 groundwater?

22 BEN FORSON: Groundwater becomes an issue when you
23 find soil contamination.

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: So there's a model that shows
25 you if there's soil?

1 BEN FORSON: If you assess the soil and we find
2 contamination, that triggers groundwater investigation.

3 SEAN SHELDRAKE: This process was initially, you
4 know, focused on prioritizing, as Barry said, the ordnance
5 issues. What we're trying to do is at the same time focus on,
6 you know, what areas where there could be - not that there
7 will be, but there could be - some residual contamination, and
8 flag those so we know where soil samples may need to be taken.
9 From there, if there is a problem indicated, that might
10 trigger further investigation in the groundwater.

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: We already have evidence that
12 it is. It's not a potential anymore.

13 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's right. Let me address that,
14 please.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Sure.

16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Demo Area 1, we have monitoring
17 wells in. We're putting in more monitoring wells.

18 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I understand.

19 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We're also putting in site-wide
20 groundwater monitoring wells. We are addressing groundwater
21 in numerous ways if we find other source areas. And the
22 primary source areas where you probably may - or potentially
23 may, I should say - find groundwater contamination would be
24 the three demo areas because there would be a source of
25 material there, and maybe target areas. That's my belief.

1 You're not going to find probably any in firing points,
2 because there wasn't a lot of depth position there.

3 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: My question is, once you do
4 find -- I know Landfill 4, we've already found it, you already
5 have tests. If you look in the other demolition areas and do
6 find contamination in the soil, do you have something to look
7 that it doesn't stop there, you're going to now test the
8 water?

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Right. That's right. Same
10 approach. It's the same approach. In fact, the best thing is
11 to -- you find the source area where it's concentrated, try to
12 dig it up and get it out of there so it stops recontaminating
13 groundwater.

14 VALERIE LANE: I know right up here on where this
15 fan is on this, that the water flows out of Camp Bonneville,
16 it comes down the hill.

17 BARRY ROGOWSKI: The creek or groundwater?

18 VALERIE LANE: I know the water flows here, comes
19 down this way, around the hill, comes right back in
20 (indicating). The water is flowing to the south. It goes
21 east to west, back west, flows right back into the Camp
22 Bonneville.

23 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's a good point. The last
24 meeting on Tuesday, we proposed putting two wells here, two
25 wells here, deep and shallow. But we're going to let our

1 hydro-geologist look at it. These will look for contamination
2 that will potentially be migrating out of the camp, and this
3 one an early warning well. We have a total of 10 wells we're
4 proposing initially to deal with that specific groundwater,
5 okay?

6 FRANK FUNK: When are you going to put your wells in
7 your main impact area up there?

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: First thing we've got to do is
9 clear the area, deal with the ordnance issue, before we can go
10 in and start bringing other rigs in there. The second thing
11 we would do would be to sample soils initially to see if we
12 had any highly contaminated soils. Then if we have highly
13 contaminated soils, we move to doing borings at depth. After
14 you complete borings at depth, if you have contamination at
15 depth, you put in groundwater wells to see if the stuff is
16 actually in the groundwater. So it's a bunch of phases.

17 KAREN KINGSTON: Do either of you have any knowledge
18 that the explosive contaminants that we've already identified
19 at Camp Bonneville, as well as the perchlorate, say if it was
20 introduced in, say, the '40s, it has migrated down, that it
21 wouldn't be present as -- you'd be able to use an identifiable
22 marker that there would be -- since you're using the soil as
23 your marker, you know, so-called, but if you find it in the
24 soil, that gives you reason to then consider groundwater
25 contamination?

1 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Oh, yeah.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: So do any of these particular
3 contaminants have any background on them that they would have
4 moved down so far that they might not be present in the soil
5 or at such minute trace amounts that it wouldn't even be
6 picked up on the Ecology or Army test?

7 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's a very good question.

8 BEN FORSON: That's a good question.

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Take a shot. Do you want to take a
10 shot at it? Go ahead.

11 BEN FORSON: That's a good question. It's possible.
12 It's possible in an area where, depending on the type of
13 chemical that we're looking at, maybe the (inaudible) method
14 can't go that low in detecting it in soils. In that case,
15 it's possible.

16 But with RDX and TNT, you know, the explosive
17 compounds, we will be able to detect at low concentration
18 enough that if we don't find it in the soil, then it's not in
19 the groundwater.

20 However, it's also possible that maybe it's already
21 leached out into the groundwater, so we can find it in the
22 soil. In such a situation, chances are that means it's been a
23 long time, and chances are, first, you don't have any source
24 anymore to continue leaching into the groundwater.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: I see.

1 BEN FORSON: In such a situation, that means natural
2 attenuation. So you have a kind of plume, if any. You have a
3 kind of plume moving through the formation. Now, as it moves
4 through the formation, chances are part of it is also going to
5 be absorbed into the soil particles in the groundwater as it
6 moves through. Natural chemical oxidation is going to take
7 place to reduce the concentration. So with time, it will all
8 be gone.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: I don't think that's the case with
10 ammonia perchlorate, according to case studies.

11 BEN FORSON: Most, if not all, organic chemicals
12 will degrade. The difference is the rate at which they
13 degrade. If not at soil degradation, you have absorption.
14 Every chemical, when it comes into contact with soil, some
15 level will be absorbed into soil particles. There, too, it's
16 a matter of the extent of the absorption.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: If you find some wells with,
18 let's say, ammonium perchlorate, and you cannot find the
19 primary source, you've dug it up and it still is a problem, do
20 you have a means to treat that water as it moves? Ammonium
21 perchlorate, won't it last 100 million years or something?

22 KAREN KINGSTON: Something huge.

23 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Is there a way, if that case
24 did happen in one of these sites, is there a way to start to
25 deal with it in the water? You can't dig up the whole place.

1 Is there a way to remedy this, if you do find a large plume,
2 that you cannot find a primary release area to dispose of? Do
3 you understand what I'm saying?

4 BEN FORSON: Okay. If you find a plume, and you
5 can't find the source, then you have to look at the
6 concentration, okay? You have to look at the concentration
7 profile, distance, to see if some sort of natural attenuation
8 has taken place. It may not be biodegradable, but you still
9 have natural absorption taking place, so you have to assess
10 that.

11 If there is indication that it's not the scenario --
12 the concentration is not decreasing at a faster rate compared
13 to sensitive receptors down-gradient, then that means
14 something would have to be done.

15 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: And there are things to do?

16 BEN FORSON: There are. Oh, yeah, there are.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Okay. I wanted to know that.

18 BEN FORSON: There are. It's only a matter of
19 money, but there are.

20 FRANK FUNK: Can you find this ammonium perchlorate
21 where it -- in areas where it has not been in a military place
22 and there's no explosion happened? Is this located anywhere
23 else in the ground other than where military activities have
24 been?

25 GREG JOHNSON: It mainly comes from rocket

1 propellants.

2 FRANK FUNK: I can't hear you.

3 GREG JOHNSON: It mainly comes from rocket
4 propellants. Normally where they've been finding it has been
5 in disposal areas. In my understanding of it, it migrates
6 through the soil very rapidly.

7 FRANK FUNK: So if you had 640 acres out here in the
8 hills somewhere, it hadn't been used as a military -- no
9 rockets or anything exploded on it, you wouldn't find it?

10 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You wouldn't find it.

11 GREG JOHNSON: You wouldn't find it. It was made
12 for military purposes, like I said, mainly single-base rocket
13 propellants.

14 KAREN KINGSTON: You can't blame it on cow dung.

15 FRANK FUNK: That's the reason I asked the question.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: I figured that.

17 GREG JOHNSON: I have some information on that if
18 any of you are interested. You can call me and I'll fax it or
19 e-mail it to you.

20 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Can we let Greg try to get through?
21 We can ask some questions after we're done, too.

22 GREG JOHNSON: I'll start going. Does everybody
23 pretty much understand this then, how this CSM is working?

24 DAWNE GARDISKA: What's a CSM?

25 GREG JOHNSON: Conceptual site model.

1 I'll skip on down to the next table. What we had to
2 do here was in order to get these sites to rank -- to rank
3 these sites, we had to go through several different things.
4 This right here is the ordnance-related activities, primary
5 source, then the likelihood of contamination for that.

6 Ordnance storage, the primary source is going to be
7 storage magazines and transfer points. That's where they kept
8 the explosives, that's where they brought them out for the
9 troop training, left them, and then used them. So the
10 likelihood of contamination there is low.

11 Then you go down to weapons training. A firing
12 point, medium. Target areas, definitely high because that's
13 where the unexploded ordnance is going to be found. That's
14 where the projectiles, mortars, what have you, were fired.
15 They hit and they didn't detonate. They're probably
16 subsurface. So that is a high.

17 Range safety fans we put down as low. I've got
18 another slide here we'll go over as far as that goes. There's
19 some calculations that Norrell knows very well. He was an
20 artillery officer in the Army, so he knows how that works, and
21 he can explain that to you very well.

22 I'm sorry, Frank, go ahead.

23 FRANK FUNK: What raises the firing point to a
24 medium? What raises that? Is it from the propellant that
25 sends it? Is that what it is?

1 GREG JOHNSON: The firing point I believe on
2 medium --

3 FRANK FUNK: It says medium. What causes that? Is
4 that from the propellant that fires the projectile?

5 NORRELL LANTZER: No. What that is, you have
6 mishandling, loss, burial. You aren't going to bury one item;
7 you're going to bury several items together. So it's not
8 going to be a single event; you're going to have much more.

9 FRANK FUNK: What are you going to bury?

10 ERIC WAEHLING: They're concerned about a lazy
11 soldier.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: If you don't use it, bury it?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

14 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Bury it instead of carry it back to
15 the ammo depot.

16 GREG JOHNSON: We gave that a medium concern. There
17 may be nothing there, but we gave it a medium.

18 Troop training. Training areas we rated high,
19 maneuver areas low.

20 And then the bottom was ordnance demilitarization.
21 Open burn, open detonation, we definitely ranked that high
22 because it's visible and it's there.

23 Okay, now, this was a very contentious issue for us.
24 It changed a lot from the one from Adak. Earlier -- this is
25 the hazard severity ranking for the ordnance we have. Now, to

1 make this table, we used Appendix H of the Archive Search
2 Report, which went through all the ordnance that's been found
3 out there and the ordnance that was probable out there for the
4 time frame that it was used. And we ranked these items as
5 catastrophic, critical, marginal or negligible.

6 Now, earlier we were discussing items that would be
7 detonated, you know, using the OB/OD. Personally, I would say
8 probably Items 1 through 3 would probably be detonated on-site
9 due to an explosive safety hazard and somebody getting hurt
10 trying to move them or anything like that.

11 Ranking number one is UXOs with sensitive fusing,
12 and safety hazard was catastrophic. Deployed munitions, fired
13 munitions with sensitive fusing that had failed to function as
14 designed. That's a good example, a 105 or a 155 with a
15 mechanical time fuse that's been fired, and it's landed, it
16 didn't go off, and a simple jarring of it could function it
17 even to this day and set it off - and you know the rest.

18 The other one was critical with a little bit less
19 sensitive fusing, but still probable to detonate.

20 You get down through three. You know, some of that
21 stuff in three you could move but you might not want to. Some
22 of it you wouldn't.

23 And then getting down into four and five is
24 basically your small arms, soil contamination, things like
25 that.

1 This table is our ordnance-related activities. You
2 have your ordnance storage. The primary source would be
3 magazines and transfer points. It's usually non-deployed.
4 And we would rank that at a four.

5 As you can see, the weapons training, primary
6 sources, and how we would rank that as we go. It gets a
7 little more complex here. UXO with sensitive fusing, UXO with
8 less sensitive fusing. And those are all mainly the same:
9 troop training, ordnance demil, stuff like that.

10 These are the likelihood of contamination for the
11 primary sources. Your target area would have an explosive -
12 because that's where the munitions have been fired - would
13 have an explosive hazard ranking of one. The likelihood of
14 contamination there is going to be high because that's the
15 place they were shooting at, that's the target. So that would
16 default to a one, then so on and so forth for all the
17 different activities.

18 PETE CAPELL: I'm not quite sure how that table
19 worked then. How did -- you have an explosive hazard ranking.

20 GREG JOHNSON: The table before that where we had
21 the catastrophic, critical?

22 PETE CAPELL: Right.

23 GREG JOHNSON: That was the hazard ranking.

24 BARRY ROGOWSKI: This table or the one up?

25 PETE CAPELL: This table. But then your default --

1 GREG JOHNSON: We're defaulting that. We're going
2 to call this a severity ranking of one because of the --

3 BARRY ROGOWSKI: There's a default value which could
4 be adjusted based on other factors later.

5 GREG JOHNSON: Later on in the screening. Because
6 the fact it was explosive hazard ranking one, which is
7 catastrophic, and the likelihood of contamination because it
8 was a target, that's where all the ordnance fell, that's why
9 it went to a one.

10 PETE CAPELL: That's why like when you go down to
11 the range safety fan, you have a low and an explosive hazard
12 ranking of five. So why is it a one?

13 NORRELL LANTZER: If you find an item out there,
14 unexploded ordnance, therefore it's a one. But you aren't
15 going to have a whole bunch of them.

16 PETE CAPELL: Okay.

17 GREG JOHNSON: But what you will have will probably
18 be catastrophic.

19 NORRELL LANTZER: Like Barry said, this gives the
20 analyst, if he doesn't have any other information, he's got a
21 default. If he's got information, it adjusts based upon the
22 information that he has.

23 GREG JOHNSON: Then we get into the likelihood of
24 residual contamination. The same thing, we have our
25 ordnance-related activities, we have our primary source, how

1 it was put there, and then the likelihood of residual
2 contamination.

3 As you can see, like ordnance storage, magazines,
4 transfer points, chances are there's nothing going to be
5 there, because when Camp Bonneville -- when they said, "Okay,
6 everybody out of here," they brought their trucks down, they
7 took all the explosives, they cleaned out the magazines and
8 they left.

9 KAREN KINGSTON: I have a question.

10 GREG JOHNSON: Sure.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: Some other sites have found in the
12 ordnance storage areas, back years ago, that they also did
13 shell loading.

14 NORRELL LANTZER: On these areas, they did no
15 manufacture of loading here.

16 KAREN KINGSTON: They didn't do any reloads?

17 GREG JOHNSON: No. There are sites within
18 Washington that they did. Jackson Park is one. There's
19 several others, as a matter of fact.

20 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yes.

21 GREG JOHNSON: They did demilling. They actually
22 put the explosives into the projectiles, everything.

23 KAREN KINGSTON: So there's no archive that there
24 was any reloading done --

25 GREG JOHNSON: No.

1 KAREN KINGSTON: -- at Camp Bonneville?

2 GREG JOHNSON: None at all.

3 NORRELL LANTZER: These were basic storage bunkers.

4 Even that, as on the ACTW side, Eric has done some testing in
5 the munitions storage area.

6 ERIC WAEHLING: Limited soil review.

7 GREG JOHNSON: Then some of the other things, the
8 accessibility, how we ranked that was zero- to 15-degree slope
9 we put as accessible, steep was 16 to 25 degrees, and
10 inaccessible was greater than 25 degrees. That's a pretty
11 good-sized hill where we know no one's going to be going.

12 And then the future use intensity was factored into
13 it. That's how we came up with our outcomes. I've got
14 another slide that I'll go over that, a little easier to
15 understand.

16 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: The inaccessible areas, are
17 they going to be fenced off?

18 BARRY ROGOWSKI: If they're in the impact area, it's
19 going to remain to be fenced. If it's outside the impact
20 area, it's not.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Has it been checked over with
22 the magnetometers?

23 NORRELL LANTZER: Once you start seeing the maps,
24 you'll see there's very few locations where you have actual
25 targets. The accessibility starts playing into a

1 prioritization, to where we go back to the BCT, "Here is your
2 prioritization list, this is high-intensity use, but basically
3 inaccessible, do you want to go up there?"

4 There are some inaccessible areas in the impact
5 range, but you've got inaccessible areas, a lot of other
6 areas, where we don't expect to have any impact areas.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Say we had two sites, we had to
8 prioritize which one we did first. One was accessible, one
9 was less accessible. We're going to address the one that has
10 high accessibility first, then move on. It's a prioritization
11 process.

12 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: But it will be hit? You will
13 look at that area?

14 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

15 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: You just don't look at it
16 first?

17 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

18 IAN RAY: Steep slopes can slump. Is there any
19 accommodation for future concern?

20 GREG JOHNSON: Well, there's always future concern.
21 You know, we have other issues, frost heave, things like that.
22 But that will be addressed probably as a risk management
23 decision.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: This is for how things sit now.

25 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah. This is for basically how

1 we're going to go out and attack the ordnance. That is a very
2 good question, though, and that's what our decision makers
3 will decide, when that comes down to it.

4 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I just want to say that I
5 think it is important because, you know, as you drive along
6 the freeway, 205, there's big cliffs that aren't even parks,
7 designated as parks, people are mountain climbing on it. This
8 is going to be designated as a park, all the trails, there's
9 not going to be anyone manning those slopes and some mountain
10 climbers in Clark County... I think it should be at least
11 looked at.

12 ERIC WAEHLING: There's not much of Camp Bonneville
13 that meets the criteria of inaccessible. We're talking very
14 small percentages. It's not like a significant amount that
15 meets that criteria.

16 BARRY ROGOWSKI: But yeah, I mean, that's important.
17 What we're trying to do is categorize and prioritize and get a
18 handle on all the different areas and all the different issues
19 so that we can understand them and isolate them and attempt to
20 answer those questions in a very systemic way for every single
21 site so that it's uniform and repeatable and defensible, and
22 that makes sense.

23 GREG JOHNSON: Okay, then, some of the options, the
24 outcomes, of these, I've broke them down to be a little bit
25 easier and make them specifically for the ordnance we have

1 here so that everybody here can understand them.

2 If you'll look at our Level 1 screening, they're a
3 little bit more in-depth. But this is basically the bottom
4 line.

5 If it comes out as a NOFA, that's no further action,
6 self-explanatory, no chance of anything being there, nothing
7 will be done.

8 SI would be a site inspection. And the site
9 inspection for ordnance at Camp Bonneville is going to be an
10 instrument-aided recon.

11 Then the next step would be FS, which is feasibility
12 study. Evaluate the risk management options and alternatives,
13 costing of alternatives, MOTCA compliance, making sure it's in
14 tune with Washington State's laws.

15 Then the proposed removal, how we're going to remove
16 the items, and then the site characterization is going to be
17 geophysics and then removal. That's how it's going to work.

18 So the next slides I'll go on to are going to be
19 actually how they came out, how the areas came out.

20 FRANK FUNK: When are you going to put all this into
21 operation?

22 BARRY ROGOWSKI: They've already done the screening
23 of 108 sites, it's completed. So we had them all categorized.
24 So once we have them categorized, have all that information
25 broken down, we're going to use that to design what

1 subsurface --

2 FRANK FUNK: When will the actual work start?

3 BARRY ROGOWSKI: When is the actual geophysical work
4 going to start?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Clearance work?

6 FRANK FUNK: Yeah.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Hopefully maybe as soon as next
8 year - maybe.

9 GREG JOHNSON: There's work plan reviews and things
10 like that that are going to need to take place.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: We're getting closer. I know you
12 hated to hear that when you were a kid, "We're almost there,"
13 but we really are, we're getting there.

14 FRANK FUNK: I'm going to be a real old man by the
15 time you get this done.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: Honestly, Frank, things are coming
17 together. The team is working well. It may not be
18 immediately obvious to you, but this is a very, very
19 significant step. And it may not be as far off as you think.

20 BARRY ROGOWSKI: This is very important. In fact,
21 the next piece where we've got the site either goes straight
22 into development of alternatives for cleanup or it goes into
23 needing some more information to develop those alternatives.
24 We have them as far along as which ones we're going to develop
25 for cleanup.

1 ERIC WAEHLING: I want to give full credit to the
2 technical team, to Gannett Fleming, their participation in
3 that team specifically. We have narrowed it down from 108 of
4 those AOCs, AOPCs, we're narrowing it down to 27 that we are
5 working through what additional information we need to start
6 making remedial decisions. That means 88 of them, we have
7 enough information to start making these decisions.

8 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Design the geophysical studies,
9 enough geophysical to make sure we clear that area, then clear
10 it. We have 88 of them done, where we're going to that stage.
11 27 we need to study a little bit more. Only one made a
12 determination there's no further action required.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Right.

14 KAREN KINGSTON: I didn't see any information,
15 anything on there, that had to do with drum burial. Is
16 that --

17 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's not ordnance. That's
18 hazardous substance. This is only specifically ordnance.
19 This team has been working just on ordnance for like months
20 now.

21 GREG JOHNSON: Now, Eric has a copy of these CDs.
22 I'll walk you through the process. It's real straightforward.
23 For example, we'll start with firing points because it's the
24 first one.

25 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Do summaries.

1 GREG JOHNSON: I'll go to the summaries, yeah. This
2 is how they fell out. It's hard to read, isn't it?

3 NORRELL LANTZER: Go up to your percent and up your
4 percent on it.

5 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You can just summarize basically
6 what it means.

7 GREG JOHNSON: Okay. First one is a mortar firing
8 position one. Acreage, it's half an acre. Conceptual site
9 model source type was a firing point. Accessibility, it's
10 accessible. Future land use is going to be high. And it went
11 straight to site characterization.

12 BARRY ROGOWSKI: So you can kind of see how that
13 works. You look at those factors, and then each area comes
14 out rated either site characterization or it goes straight
15 into feasibility study and we develop our cleanup options.

16 DON WASTLER: When you say "high," does that mean
17 risk?

18 GREG JOHNSON: That would be like a campground.

19 DON WASTLER: It will be clean, go ahead and use it,
20 it's safe?

21 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It means that we expect people to
22 be using that area a lot, and that makes it a high concern as
23 far as land use goes.

24 DON WASTLER: I see. I see.

25 BARRY ROGOWSKI: It's a way to rate that individual

1 area.

2 DON WASTLER: I see. I thought maybe you were going
3 to say high risk or something. I see what that means.

4 BARRY ROGOWSKI: If it's high expected land use,
5 high hazard, high potential for ordnance to be there, we place
6 a lot of emphasis on clearing that area to the maximum extent
7 possible.

8 GREG JOHNSON: So as you can see, all these pretty
9 much came out site characterization.

10 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Just go to the next.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: One more example, maybe we could
12 chew on it. I know -- I'm sure Greg would be willing to come
13 back and talk a little more in-depth once people have had a
14 chance to process.

15 GREG JOHNSON: Yeah, anytime.

16 We'll go to, say -- let's try the range safety fans.

17 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Do targets.

18 NORRELL LANTZER: Targets, because that goes in with
19 your other three slides.

20 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You can see every one of these
21 areas is broken down and categorized now very nicely.

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: That's the disc that he has?

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes. What he's looking at is the
24 same disc that I have here.

25 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Now we have all the target areas

1 coming up.

2 GREG JOHNSON: Okay, the first one is
3 three-and-a-half-inch rocket range target. The acreage was 18
4 acres. CSM source type was a target area. Accessibility is
5 accessible. Future land use is going to be low. It went to
6 site characterization required.

7 Just for a different one, we'll go down here to the
8 M203 grenade range. 48-and-a-half acres. CSM is a target
9 area. The accessibility is accessible. The future land use
10 is high. And it went to feasibility study.

11 So you can see how they change. It will change the
12 outcome, how things change.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Just one little point. This
14 document you're seeing is a draft. Actually, that 48.55 is a
15 mistake. It's actually -- the acreage is closer to 12. Just
16 so you know, that number is going to change.

17 BARRY ROGOWSKI: You get an idea of the process that
18 we spent an hour on, goes through every single factor, every
19 single site these folks could come up with, categorizes it,
20 analyzes the issues, sets priorities and actions that are
21 going to occur. So it's an extremely valuable tool to move us
22 forward to developing cleanup alternatives for those sites
23 that we can, and gathering additional information for cleanup
24 alternatives that we don't have enough yet.

25 FRANK FUNK: The word "high" means it's highly

1 likely it will be used?

2 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Yeah, for land use.

3 GREG JOHNSON: Christine, you had a question earlier
4 this week, you e-mailed me, we were talking about the range
5 safety fans and the targets, stuff like that. Norrell here is
6 going to try to help us out. We've got some slides. Is that
7 good enough there?

8 NORRELL LANTZER: Yeah, there's three slides. We've
9 been shooting artillery for a long time. Greg mentioned I was
10 an artillery officer. No, I'm not. I worked with the
11 artillery for a lot of years. I was operation evaluator for
12 them.

13 There's manuals out there where they fired millions
14 of rounds. That target box, the center point is the target,
15 and a normal distribution around that, you can see all those
16 little dots, that is weapons system based only, it's not the
17 individual firing it. We'll deal with that one next.

18 But on any given day, you fire that many rounds down
19 there, you have that many chances of getting that close to the
20 target.

21 Now, if you go to the next one, if you look, they've
22 been able to predict that going down from there, that's the
23 point of impact, 96 percent of the rounds will hit within this
24 area. That area depends upon the weapon system, how large it
25 is. 30 meters all the way up to 248 meters, based upon the

1 larger weapons systems.

2 Now, if you go down to the next one.

3 GREG JOHNSON: That's going to be tough.

4 NORRELL LANTZER: The one Jerry gave you.

5 GREG JOHNSON: Okay.

6 NORRELL LANTZER: Now, this is out of the artillery
7 field manual. That's the current manual all the way back to
8 the 1917 manual that I have. That takes into account long and
9 short rounds.

10 Now, what the contractor has done, Parsons, Jerry
11 Moore, has taken that field manual and then plotted all the
12 firing points. And then on the one car target, he started
13 these boxes based upon each one of those firing points, the 96
14 percent probability that a round is going to hit in there.
15 Any of the long rounds -- short rounds, what they've done is
16 come out from that 600 feet.

17 So he's already boxed that in for all the firing
18 targets that are up in the impact range. So that gives you
19 that extra buffer to take care of long and short rounds.

20 Ma'am?

21 KAREN KINGSTON: Did Parsons use a common equation?
22 If we had, say, Star come in and do the same analysis here,
23 would they say exactly the same thing as Parsons or is that
24 just Parsons' opinion?

25 NORRELL LANTZER: This is field manual FM6-40. It's

1 a standard artillery field manual. That's the standard
2 calculation we all use.

3 FRANK FUNK: All right. Artillery unit I was in had
4 six Howitzers. You didn't zero each Howitzer in on the same
5 spot.

6 NORRELL LANTZER: That's correct.

7 FRANK FUNK: You covered 600 yards because they were
8 a hundred apiece. Does that reflect if they had six
9 Howitzers, they expand that 600 yards?

10 NORRELL LANTZER: No. What this does is we have
11 known targets up in the impact range where you have a vehicle,
12 you have something that they're going to aim at. So on those,
13 that takes into account that one single target.

14 Now, with all the firing points out there, each one
15 of those firing points has the chance of firing at that
16 particular target. So what Parsons did is plot that around
17 each one of the known targets we know are out there. One of
18 the things we're wrestling with is the rest of the impact
19 range.

20 And with the known targets, this does take into
21 account, particularly with a 600-foot grid, to me that's even
22 more conservative than what the calculation is because he took
23 into account the target box, then added out further than that.
24 So I don't have a problem with that, being more conservative.

25 Normally, in having worked with the artillery, you

1 have three firing points. One of them, likely what they did,
2 in my hypothesis, they fired a Howitzer at one target, another
3 one at another target, and another one at another target.

4 FRANK FUNK: That isn't how it worked with us.

5 NORRELL LANTZER: Was that at Camp Bonneville?
6 There's some constraints I think we have at Camp Bonneville
7 that you don't have at some of the other bases. National
8 Training Center, we had big target boxes. Here we don't have
9 a large target box. But we also have a big impact range, too.
10 These are on known targets where we know a vehicle or
11 something that they can aim at is out there. Now we're
12 starting to deal with the rest of the impact range.

13 Does that help, Frank?

14 FRANK FUNK: Yeah. The Howitzers set about 50 yards
15 apart. They would cover a hundred yards. You're only
16 covering maybe 300 yard with the overlap.

17 NORRELL LANTZER: Yeah.

18 MIKE NELSON: I think also one thing to consider at
19 Camp Bonneville, this is unlike a lot of the major training
20 centers, like Fort Lewis, where you had massive amounts of
21 artillery fired, centers on the east coast where they had
22 large training done out there.

23 Camp Bonneville is quite unique. It was
24 infrequently used for artillery. There are not many rounds
25 that were fired. I think Eric might know the number,

1 approximately, per year. But it's not much at all.

2 NORRELL LANTZER: By unit, it's 50.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: You're saying there were 50
4 explosions?

5 NORRELL LANTZER: By unit. And that was from the
6 ASR.

7 MIKE NELSON: So it's not a major concentration of
8 artillery in the target area.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: Relatively speaking, Fort Lewis
10 fired 24,000 rounds last year.

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: How many were fired a year at
12 Bonneville?

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Our records indicate in the
14 neighborhood of 80 to 100 a year. They're probably not
15 complete, but it gives a sense of scale when you're talking
16 some of these training facilities versus Camp Bonneville.

17 NORRELL LANTZER: Also, Frank, another thing. When
18 you do a battery sheath, if we plotted a battery sheath, which
19 I don't think these targets are, the 105 is a 248 meter by 248
20 meter battery target box.

21 FRANK FUNK: Have to talk feet to me.

22 NORRELL LANTZER: All my manuals were 1917, in
23 meters.

24 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: How do you know the target
25 for each training maneuver because of time?

1 NORRELL LANTZER: And that's a good question. These
2 are the ones that are currently out there right now where we
3 know we have something. So what the proposal that we're
4 looking at on those is, you know, we know it's there, we know
5 we're going to have contamination, it can go into a
6 feasibility study.

7 We know the stuff is there. Now we have to do
8 something with the rest of the impact range that may have been
9 scarified or it's just been fired on. That's one of the tasks
10 we are working on tomorrow.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: I think it's common knowledge how
12 many times Camp Bonneville has been logged, logged down to
13 nothing, through the years. So we would assume that back in
14 those days they probably used dozers, skidders, which it looks
15 like there's been bombs there just when you run a dozer
16 through trying to move logs.

17 Have you moved away from the idea of sending people
18 out, "I don't see a dimple or an indentation"? Have you moved
19 away from that attitude in identifying your areas or are you
20 still not taking consideration the past history of the
21 logging? Big question.

22 NORRELL LANTZER: It's not a big question. Go back
23 to the CSM, you look at the hypothesis of the loss mechanism.
24 If I had mishandling and loss, I've dropped it or thrown it
25 over here. What I also take into account is certain areas.

1 This whole area here was scarified back in '74. You can see
2 it was clear-cut, scarified, the stuff was pushed this way
3 (indicating). I don't expect to see surface stuff here
4 previous to '74.

5 What I would expect is anything that was there is
6 going to be in this little area that way (indicating). After
7 '74, we're looking at how much training was there. But,
8 again, that's going to be surface and above, not subsurface.
9 Shouldn't have to do subsurface work there because it's not
10 the expected mechanism to have subsurface.

11 In this area, we expect to see subsurface. So, yes,
12 we do look, and we do have people out doing site
13 reconnaissance, instrument aided, but that's only a data
14 point. That feeds into this.

15 As you notice, with all the site reconnaissance, a
16 lot of the areas are still going. Now we need to go with site
17 characterization, geophysics work, because they were only
18 looking at surface and trying to get an indication for
19 subsurface with cratering. But it's been a lot of years.
20 We're still going back into those areas with geophysics.

21 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Do you have work logs for the
22 other countries that trained there?

23 NORRELL LANTZER: I don't have any information from
24 the ASR, the current ASR, with other countries in use there.

25 KAREN KINGSTON: By "no information," you don't

1 believe they were there?

2 NORRELL LANTZER: No. I'm saying the current ASR
3 materials that we do have from Eric is all US work.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: That's the information we have. I
5 mean, I know foreign troops trained there. We don't have much
6 information from them.

7 KAREN KINGSTON: Is there any way to retrieve that,
8 by maybe officer logs or something?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: I know we looked into it. I can't
10 answer that directly.

11 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Why is that important, whether
12 foreign troops trained there or not? I just want to know.
13 They shot, too, I guess.

14 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Did they have different
15 target areas and different practice routines they used?

16 KAREN KINGSTON: For instance, the prince, what's
17 his name, royal, I can't remember.

18 BUD VAN CLEVE: Albert.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: Albert, there you go. They were
20 there on a regular basis. And they brought with them ammo
21 from Great Britain. Now, Great Britain's use of certain, you
22 know, explosives as far as what's going to shove, you know,
23 that is -- that was much different than what we were using.

24 NORRELL LANTZER: In some cases, yes.

25 GREG JOHNSON: Most of those are NATO rounds.

1 NORRELL LANTZER: Most of those are standard NATO
2 rounds that NATO countries use the same caliber to interrelate
3 so we can fire their stuff and they can fire ours.

4 GREG JOHNSON: Going to war with them, we have to
5 use the same stuff.

6 KAREN KINGSTON: Would there be a point of entry log
7 for bringing it in? Is that military, nobody -- they're kind
8 of exempt from having to open their luggage?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: We don't have that information
10 currently.

11 NORRELL LANTZER: You are correct. I've done a lot
12 of training with foreign countries, and having them into sites
13 that I've had. But right now you have no range logs to say
14 they were there. Even if they were, they would not be doing
15 anything in the different areas because those areas are fairly
16 well solid. It was either a training area, maneuver area,
17 firing point, et cetera. But even at that, we found -- on
18 this last reconnaissance, we found a small arms range we
19 didn't know about. That's why we put people out there to find
20 those things.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: For instance, there was a group in
22 the mid '80s, I believe, early '80s, that came from South
23 America -- Central America, excuse me. I can't remember the
24 name of that one general that got in trouble up on the hill, a
25 bunch of Central American things. Even when they were there,

1 several of them ended up thinking -- they stayed on my
2 property in one of my sheds thinking that was part of Camp
3 Bonneville. They were out of whack for what they thought was
4 the area.

5 I mean, are you look -- is there any way for you to
6 look into some of these kind of activities?

7 NORRELL LANTZER: That would be new ASR information.
8 Again, when you see the NOFA, that's based on the information
9 currently available. As new information becomes available,
10 areas go back into the screening process.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: Got it.

12 NORRELL LANTZER: This is not a stop loop. It's a
13 continual cycle. As you get more information, put it back
14 through the screen.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: We've thrown an awful lot on the
16 table here. Norrell, Greg, myself, any of us will be
17 available to come back at a future time. I encourage you to
18 ask us to come back and talk about this.

19 I'll get hard copies of the document that Greg was
20 referring to, and I will include those with the minutes when
21 we send them out. I have disc copies of the backup
22 information that fed into these decision documents here. I
23 have 10 copies. I can make more. I ran out of discs, to be
24 honest, when I was making these last Friday.

25 We also have remaining on the agenda, it's 9:15,

1 Agreed Order, then I have one or two little items that I
2 forgot to hand out before we adjourn. I would like to ask
3 that we move on to the next item.

4 BUD VAN CLEVE: Go.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Agreed Order.

6 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Briefly on the Agreed Order, what
7 we're doing, what it contains.

8 Our Agreed Order with Army, the big important things
9 in it is that it includes measures requiring either cleanup
10 and/or study of many areas as soon as possible. That includes
11 Demo Area 1, Landfill 4, pretty much total removal of that
12 landfill, the source area; all the known small arms firing
13 range berms that have high concentrations of lead, the high
14 concentrations of lead will be removed, as well as
15 installation of monitoring wells around the base boundary;
16 then wells inside of the base to determine if contamination is
17 moving off base because the groundwater issue is such an
18 important issue to all of you.

19 The rest of the Agreed Order also sets the schedule
20 and describes the work to be performed for cleanup of all the
21 known contaminated areas on the entire military reservation,
22 Camp Bonneville.

23 A couple folks that I work with stayed home this
24 week to work with the Attorney Generals to finalize -- work on
25 finalizing the draft. Our goal is to get it out next week to

1 the Army and to all of you in this room to start reviewing.
2 We're setting a 60-day clock for negotiations so it will be
3 finalized hopefully in August.

4 DAWNE GARDISKA: Discussions, changes.

5 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Negotiations with the Army, receipt
6 of comment.

7 ERIC WAEHLING: I'd like to emphasize that the Army
8 is doing work without the Agreed Order; that this is
9 formalizing decisions, relationships, interaction.

10 BARRY ROGOWSKI: That's a good point. The Army is
11 moving forward independently with a lot of work. Kind of
12 locks in on it pretty solid.

13 JEROEN KOK: Barry, do you think it would be helpful
14 at maybe the next RAB meeting, once the Agreed Order is
15 released, that you spend some time walking the RAB through the
16 Agreed Order --

17 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Sure.

18 JEROEN KOK: -- even briefly?

19 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Sure. I'd be more than happy to do
20 that.

21 JEROEN KOK: I'll throw that out as a potential
22 agenda item for next time.

23 DON WASTLER: I have just one quick question.

24 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Sure.

25 DON WASTLER: All of these abbreviations that you've

1 been using, I was going to ask if there was some index. I see
2 there is. In this pamphlet that Eric handed out, I see there
3 is an index in there that covers most of the abbreviations.
4 Are they in here? For example, if I review the minutes of
5 tonight's meeting, I can refer to this to find out what the
6 abbreviations that you're using are?

7 KAREN KINGSTON: May I say something? I'm making a
8 glossary of abbreviations and some of the terms that are
9 commonly used. Then I was just going to print it up and hand
10 it out to all of us.

11 DON WASTLER: That would be great.

12 KAREN KINGSTON: So we could look them up. I'm not
13 taking them from minutes or anything like that, I'm actually
14 getting them off of the sites.

15 ERIC WAEHLING: Washington State MOTCA actually does
16 have a glossary of these acronyms.

17 DON WASTLER: I was going to ask.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: We could make a copy.

19 DON WASTLER: I just looked in here and there is a
20 contents with most of the abbreviations.

21 ERIC WAEHLING: We can make a copy of that.

22 DON WASTLER: I was going to ask if the
23 abbreviations you're using, if I can look them up and find
24 them in here.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

1 DON WASTLER: That's all I was asking.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: The acronyms are the same.

3 Any other questions? We have one other issue. A
4 party from Clark County went back and talked with some upper
5 management, if you will, with the Assistant Secretary of the
6 Army for Installation Management, and Pete Capell was part of
7 that group with Clark County. He would like to share with
8 folks what happened.

9 PETE CAPELL: There was four of us from Clark County
10 that went back to Washington, D.C., last week to meet with
11 folks that Eric mentioned. Long titles, hard to get them all
12 straight. But it was myself; Commissioner Stanton; Bill
13 Baron, the County administrator; and Bronson Potter, our legal
14 counsel. The purpose of the trip was to talk to them about
15 the possibility of early transfer for the facility.

16 We received an extremely positive response. In
17 fact, essentially kind of the verbal go ahead. The
18 Undersecretary was very positive about it for a couple of
19 reasons. One is that the current administration is eager to
20 streamline things, and the sooner that they can transfer
21 surplus property, that leads to that goal. They're also
22 looking at a second BRAC list in 2005. If they haven't
23 transferred a number of those properties off the first list,
24 that's going to be a harder sell when they take that to
25 Congress.

1 The advantage to us locally is several things. One
2 is that the funding for all of the remediation that comes out
3 of the work that's currently taking place is uncertain, and
4 the schedule could be quite a long time before the work's
5 completed, and the site could be available for public use
6 consistent with the reuse plan.

7 Whereas with early transfer, one option is that
8 those monies would be made available for the County to move
9 forward with those corrective actions so it could be done in
10 an expedited process to complete the work much sooner than
11 what we might see outside otherwise.

12 The other thing that was extremely positive, I felt,
13 is, as Eric said, there's been a lot of progress made here
14 recently, but there's still some work that needs to be done.
15 In order to do some of that work, some additional resources
16 are necessary.

17 We got her commitment that they would put whatever
18 resources are necessary to make sure that this site
19 characterization work can be completed in a timely manner
20 because the target that was established last week was to have
21 all of this work completed, the negotiations done, and have a
22 transfer in June of '03.

23 So it was a very positive meeting. We're looking
24 forward to that.

25 IAN RAY: What are the chances of having a press

1 release to what you have just told the RAB?

2 PETE CAPELL: Because of the active involvement of
3 the RAB, I'm sharing that information with you. But that was
4 verbal at this point. There are letters going back and forth.
5 I haven't specifically talked to the Commissioner about the
6 timeline for doing that.

7 But my sense would be that they may want to wait
8 until we have something more formal than just a verbal
9 direction and verbal agreement. I think that would be more
10 prudent.

11 KAREN KINGSTON: Does Clark County feel -- I know
12 there's a lot of budget issues for parks. Is this going to
13 create a problem in the transfer?

14 PETE CAPELL: No, because through CERCLA, the Army
15 is responsible for cleaning it up. And with early transfer,
16 it's essentially committing those dollars and appropriating
17 them through how many years ultimately comes out in the plan.
18 So it doesn't end up being an additional cost to the County.

19 KAREN KINGSTON: Even for legal? Would there have
20 to be a bump-up in the allotted dollars to legal in order to
21 take care of this, to follow up, make sure CERCLA is followed?

22 PETE CAPELL: As I see it, no. I mean, those are
23 details that still need to be worked out. But the cost that
24 the County would incur to take on these things, most of that
25 would be covered by the Army.

1 One of the other very nice benefits of this sort of
2 methodology to do this is that through that early transfer
3 agreement, there can be money set aside so that -- to insure
4 the risk associated with that. And it's not just, you know,
5 environmental hazard, but it's also cost overrun so that if we
6 all agree through all of the work that's done and all of the
7 investigations, all of the cost estimates, that it's going to
8 cost X dollars, there can be insurance that would, in case
9 it's 15 or 20 or 50 percent over that estimate, that that
10 isn't something that the County would be caught holding the
11 bag.

12 And that also protects the Army, too, because they
13 end up, through that agreement, saying, "Okay, here is the
14 dollar amount," that's how much they're going to spend. They
15 have a firm, fixed cost. So it works for -- kind of protects
16 everyone's interest.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: So does that mean there's
18 going to be an ESCA drafted or is there already one drafted
19 for this?

20 PETE CAPELL: There will be one drafted, provided
21 that -- that's the direction that was agreed we wanted to
22 pursue. But the ESCA would not be able to be drafted until
23 all of the work that we're talking about today for full
24 characterization is completed. Because what that does, it's
25 an agreement that indicates what the remediation is going to

1 be, how much it's going to cost, and those sorts of things.
2 So you can't do that without the work that's being undertaken
3 right now.

4 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I just need to clarify. So
5 in a year from about this month, the County feels confident
6 that the Army will have a dollar amount figure that they can
7 put on this whole project that will clean it up, regardless of
8 discovery that continues happening?

9 PETE CAPELL: Well, I look at Eric because Eric
10 didn't have the privilege of attending that meeting, so maybe
11 a lot of brass that didn't have all the details were making
12 commitments on what Eric was going to do.

13 ERIC WAEHLING: Actually, the insurance element that
14 Pete just addressed would include contingencies such as
15 undiscovered sites. If there is a dollar shortfall, my
16 understanding is, I'm still learning about this myself, but my
17 understanding is that the insurance element for cost overrun
18 could also be designed to include that.

19 PETE CAPELL: Right.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: But this meeting just took place.

21 PETE CAPELL: Thursday.

22 ERIC WAEHLING: It's a verbal discussion. We're
23 still sorting out where we're going. I have a pretty good
24 idea what my objectives are now.

25 PETE CAPELL: And, like I say, I think the one real

1 great benefit is that we have the support of the Pentagon to
2 put the resources to get all of this preliminary work done so
3 that the EE/CA can be completed and the ESCA can be prepared,
4 which I think really helps Eric in getting his work complete.

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Critical element of this is that
6 both parties have to be happy with this agreement. We can't
7 make Clark County sign up to the agreement, and Clark County
8 can't make the Army sign up to this agreement. It's something
9 that we have to jointly decide is beneficial to all parties.
10 So if that answers your question somewhat.

11 PETE CAPELL: What we've done is we've agreed
12 verbally, and there needs to be that agreement made in
13 writing, that we're going to jointly pursue that. But
14 ultimately at some point for that June timeline, sometime next
15 year that ESCA would need to be executed by all parties, and
16 then they start the paperwork to actually transfer the deed.

17 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Does the RAB or the community
18 have an input before the ESCA is finalized?

19 PETE CAPELL: Don't know that.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't know the process.

21 PETE CAPELL: Haven't discussed the process.

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: I guess I am surprised
23 considering he just mentioned at the beginning of next year
24 they're just going to start doing some of this work that was
25 pages and pages of work. That's why I am surprised of the

1 June date.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: The work I'm speaking of would be --
3 theoretically, when the early transfer occurs, if there's an
4 ESCA agreement, what we mean by ESCA is there's a sum of money
5 associated with the transfer to Clark County to the cleanup.
6 That work Clark County is doing instead of the Army. Maybe I
7 misunderstood you.

8 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Clark County, once you get a
9 dollar amount, Clark County will finish up that cleanup?

10 PETE CAPELL: That's certainly one of the scenarios.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: So they would hire Parsons
12 Engineering, like we have, or some other company. They
13 potentially could do the work.

14 Remember, this is still preliminary. The discussion
15 to agree to pursue it has just occurred. We don't have a lot
16 of details on either side -- on the Army's side. I can't
17 speak for the County. I don't know a whole lot more than that
18 right now.

19 FRANK FUNK: If the County got it, and they were to
20 finalize cleanup, would the government pay for that?

21 ERIC WAEHLING: Yes.

22 PETE CAPELL: Yes.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Are there any other questions for
24 Pete? We've run a half hour over our agenda time. I know
25 Christine has one quick --

1 KAREN KINGSTON: Karen.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: Sorry, Karen.

3 KAREN KINGSTON: This is about the ITRC. It's the
4 Interstate Technology Regulatory Council. I'm not certain,
5 does -- I know most people know what it is. I don't have my
6 paperwork here to really describe it, but I think -- I'm only
7 talking to maybe two people that don't know about the ITRC?
8 Okay, and Bud. To make time go by faster, I can talk to you
9 about that just after the meeting.

10 This is a -- do you want to give them an overview
11 real quick? I'm sorry.

12 NORRELL LANTZER: The ITRC is a state consortium, 38
13 states belong to it. They all get together. They work
14 regulatory issues. They have DoD participation. They have
15 EPA participation. But it's run by the state regulators.
16 Greg is a new member on our UXO group. I'm a member.

17 KAREN KINGSTON: I found out about it. So I was
18 looking into it because there's going to be sort of a basic
19 training conference type thing on UXO up in Seattle. I
20 noticed that they had an inclusion. In fact, they were avidly
21 promoting the inclusion of RAB stakeholders that were active
22 community impacted people and whatnot.

23 So, anyway, I had gotten ahold of Stacy ^ Kingsberry
24 and found out that we had a bit of problem, that Stella
25 Bourassa went to the ITRC, signed up on behalf of this RAB,

1 and attended the conference in Boston. She received the
2 scholarship that they offer once a year type of thing to one
3 RAB member and one tribal member from each RAB that pays for
4 airfare or gasoline, hotel and a government per diem for food,
5 and also covers a waiver for the \$500 registration fee into
6 the conference. She did so on behalf of the RAB, went to the
7 conference on behalf of us.

8 So I would like to add for next time possibly that
9 Ian organizes a small group or something to include something
10 in the bylaws so this doesn't happen again. I'm actually not
11 getting after the fact that she did it. It was a loophole.
12 I've looked through everything. I don't see anything that
13 says somebody can't do that.

14 I would like to have that not happen again. I was
15 looking at everything when I discovered it to bring it back to
16 the RAB to see if we wanted to send -- you know, have somebody
17 represent us and whatnot.

18 So, anyway, getting ahold of Stacy ^ Kingsberry, I
19 believe she's the Western States coordinator.

20 NORRELL LANTZER: She is a contractor working for
21 ITRC, coordinating for the basic force.

22 KAREN KINGSTON: Anyway, she called me, said that
23 they had looked into the situation, the fact that a member
24 from Florida had represented us, and the rest of us didn't
25 know anything about it.

1 So she very graciously - and if anybody helped this
2 out, I appreciate it - she very graciously has made an
3 allowance for us. She has invited three of our members to go
4 up to the Seattle conference. It's July 23rd and 24th of this
5 year. It's on UXO. The fee will be waived for the
6 registration. They'll also give the scholarship back to our
7 RAB and give gasoline. She's blocked out three hotel rooms at
8 the conference site. There will be a government-allowed per
9 diem for food.

10 Possibly if maybe the community RAB could stay after
11 and then we -- she needs to know if we are going to -- maybe
12 not who we're going to send, but if we're going to send three
13 or not, you know, for the room availability, so she can keep
14 that open for other people.

15 So I just wanted to report to you that I'm so happy
16 that we've at least -- whether we send anybody or not, we've
17 at least been opened back up to be able to go to this and have
18 a representative from our group here, you know, with
19 everybody's blessing.

20 ERIC WAEHLING: You may be interested to know that
21 Mr. Lantzer is one of the instructors for that class.

22 NORRELL LANTZER: Yes, I am. There's two courses
23 out there. The basic course is being done by ITRC. The
24 advanced one is being done by EPA. Greg has been to the
25 advanced course. Barry has been to the advanced course.

1 Sean, you've been to the advanced course. Some people have
2 gone to both courses.

3 But again the basic course has been designed for RAB
4 members, tribal members, or somebody who is new to this
5 business.

6 KAREN KINGSTON: UXO for Dummies?

7 ERIC WAEHLING: Significant elements of this class
8 is what we're applying at Bonneville.

9 NORRELL LANTZER: Really the difference between the
10 two is we spend -- the basic course we spend three hours on
11 site investigation, I teach. In the advanced course, I spend
12 nine hours and I make you do stuff.

13 KAREN KINGSTON: Stacy said the interaction and the
14 exchange of ideas, especially in the case of the community RAB
15 members being able to talk to each other, being there in one
16 venue, being able to discuss our site problems that we feel
17 with other RAB members from other places that maybe have
18 similar or the same characterization problems.

19 NORRELL LANTZER: During the case study portions,
20 the interaction that we see, because we normally get 80 to 90
21 people in the ITRC course, we have 50 in the EPA course, the
22 interactions with the DoD guys, the state guys, the local
23 guys.

24 ERIC WAEHLING: I don't want to cut this off short.
25 We are 35 minutes over our agenda. If you want to talk to

1 Norrell more about this, I'm sure he'd be happy to.

2 KAREN KINGSTON: I have one last question. Have you
3 all decided whether or not you'll allow a community RAB member
4 into the BCT?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: Do we want to have that discussion
6 now?

7 KAREN KINGSTON: If you want to tell us later. I
8 just want to know if you talked about it.

9 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I think we haven't decided it yet.
10 We'd like to discuss it sometime at much more length.

11 ERIC WAEHLING: In the future, right.

12 FRANK FUNK: He talked about the bylaws. It's
13 already in the bylaws. It's under Section 9, second
14 paragraph. "RAB members may not speak for the RAB as a whole.
15 The RAB is a non-(inaudible) building body but can only speak
16 as individuals or a spokesperson for the group."

17 Stella was not elected as a representative, the
18 person to go, so she was there in error. If we want to send
19 three people up there, this body could elect to do that under
20 E of Section 9.

21 KAREN KINGSTON: Okay.

22 BARRY ROGOWSKI: There you go.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: Thank you.

24 BARRY ROGOWSKI: Good meeting.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: One quick thing. I have the

1 preliminary results from all four samplings of the well up at
2 Landfill 4, to include the ones that included the three
3 drinking water wells on Camp Bonneville. They're available to
4 you here. I have additional copies of the RAB bylaws with the
5 signature page on the back, if you want that. I also have
6 copies of the disc, 10 copies of the disc, available to you,
7 which Greg was using. All that remains is when you want to
8 meet next.

9 BRUCE OVERBAY: August.

10 JEROEN KOK: July.

11 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: July.

12 VALERIE LANE: Is there enough for July?

13 KAREN KINGSTON: Wouldn't you know the BCT situation
14 by July?

15 ERIC WAEHLING: We can discuss the BCT situation in
16 July.

17 JEROEN KOK: Agreed Order will be issued.

18 ERIC WAEHLING: That will be most likely issued by
19 then.

20 IAN RAY: Will there be notes from the BCT from May
21 and June?

22 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Can I ask that we get the
23 verbatim notes, of the BCT notes?

24 ERIC WAEHLING: They're just meeting notes. They're
25 not court recorded transcripts.

1 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: We got two types last month,
2 and one was --

3 ERIC WAEHLING: The BCT asks the note taker to
4 abbreviate and not try to get verbatim, but just to document
5 decisions that were made. You get the same thing we get, the
6 only notes that are generated.

7 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Why is there such a
8 difference between the first notes and the second?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: The first notes she was attempting
10 to -- she was trying to document the meeting as if she was a
11 court reporter. That was not the intent. The meeting minutes
12 are to allow the BCT to refer to them to document the
13 highlights of the meeting and decisions, agreements that were
14 made.

15 CHRISTINE SUTHERLAND: Can you request that she goes
16 back to her old ways?

17 ERIC WAEHLING: We won't do that.

18 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We talked about that. The thing
19 was, we had three meetings, and I think I got like 85 pages of
20 meeting minutes. It's like can you review and approve of all
21 these -- I'm like 85 pages. I don't have time to read 85
22 pages.

23 ERIC WAEHLING: And they weren't useful. Their
24 intent is so we can refer back to what was -- the highlights
25 of the next meeting.

1 BARRY ROGOWSKI: I want to capture the main,
2 important stuff.

3 FRANK FUNK: Will you have enough material for us to
4 have a productive meeting in July?

5 ERIC WAEHLING: I think we've covered what we have
6 in July that we know of to date.

7 FRANK FUNK: We'd just be doing over what we've
8 already done today?

9 ERIC WAEHLING: We'd have the draft Agreed Order
10 that we could go through with you. We will have the
11 discussion about the BCT meeting, public participation in the
12 BCT meetings. What else?

13 JEROEN KOK: We'll have the CSM with the meeting
14 minutes so we'll have an opportunity to go through that and
15 then maybe ask Greg any questions.

16 ERIC WAEHLING: You'll have had a chance to review
17 some of the documents. I'll provide copies.

18 FRANK FUNK: You'd have enough material for us to
19 have a productive meeting?

20 ERIC WAEHLING: That's up to you guys. I'm telling
21 you what we have available. You decide whether you want to
22 meet.

23 BARRY ROGOWSKI: We may think of something else
24 between now and then, too.

25 ERIC WAEHLING: I'm sure we will.

1 FRANK FUNK: Make a motion for July.

2 ERIC WAEHLING: What date would that be?

3 JEROEN KOK: July 10, second Wednesday in July.

4 ERIC WAEHLING: It would be the second Wednesday of
5 the month.

6 JEROEN KOK: I make a motion we have the next
7 meeting for the RAB July 10, 7:00.

8 BUD VAN CLEVE: Seconded.

9 ERIC WAEHLING: All in favor? The next meeting will
10 be then.

11 (Meeting adjourned.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

